THREE AEGINETAN ODES OF PINDAR

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H.W. PLEKET

C.J. RUIJGH · D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM NONAGESIMUM SEPTIMUM

ILJA LEONARD PFEIJFFER

THREE AEGINETAN ODES OF PINDAR

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

THREE AEGINETAN ODES OF PINDAR

A COMMENTARY ON *NEMEAN* V, *NEMEAN* III, & *PYTHIAN* VIII

BY

ILJA LEONARD PFEIJFFER

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
1999

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
197. Pfeijffer, Ilja Leonard: Three Aiginetan odes of Pindar. – 1999

Pfeijffer, Ilja Leonard:
Three Aeginetan odes of Pindar : a commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, & Pythian VIII / by Ilja Leonard Pfeijffer. -- Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 1999
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 197)
ISBN 90-04-11381-9

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 11381 9

© Copyright 1999 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

een dove dode taal onleesbaar
behalve voor wie zich krap zet en hard
hardnekkig zegt dit versta ik zeer goed
dit hoor ik duidelijk ja overduidelijk
dit ruisen in mijn kromgetrokken oren
is een dwaalleer vol aangepaste dogma's

Lucebert, fragment from: *oh dolorosa*
(from: *van de roerloze woelgeest*, 1993).

niemand is gezonden
woorden te wegen en te bezien
men strompelt vrijwillig
van letter naar letter
roept oe en a
in de schaduw der schaamte

Lucebert, fragment from: 'nu na twee
volle ogen vlammen ...'
(from: *apocrief / de analphabetische naam*, 1952).

lyriek is de moeder der politiek

Lucebert, fragment from: *school der poëzie*
(from: *apocrief / de analphabetische naam*, 1952).

CONTENTS

Preface ix

Introduction 1
The Occasional Nature of Pindar's Odes 2
The Occasional and the Conventional 4
The Occasional and Aesthetic Appraisal 6
The Occasional and the Panhellenic Dimension 7
Modern Historicism 11
Unity 12
Unity and the Occasional 15
Method 18
Pindar's Style 22
Ποικιλία 22
Implicitness 23
Implicitness in the Macro-Structure 23
Implicitness in Intersentential Relations 26
Implicitness within the Sentence 30
The Fictional Mimesis of Ex Tempore Speech 34
Relative Clauses and 'Relative Connection' 37
Linear Development: Manipulation of Expectancy and Creation of Suspense 41
Variations of Mood 45
Variations of Tempo 47
Word Order 49
'Inconcinnitas' 51
Metre 52
Pindar's Style: Towards a Synthesis 53

Different Readings 55

Nemean V 57
Date and Historical Setting 59
Interpretation 62
Proem 62
Myth 63
Closure 78
The Relevance of the Historical Setting 84
Structural Analysis 89
Metrical Analysis 92
Commentary 99

Nemean III ... 195
Date ... 197
Interpretation ... 199
Proem ... 199
First Myth: Heracles ... 202
Aeacid Myths ... 206
The Final Triad ... 216
The Relevance of the Heracles Myth ... 224
The Role of Chiron ... 228
Structural Analysis ... 232
Metrical Analysis ... 234
Commentary ... 241

Pythian VIII ... 423
Date ... 425
Interpretation ... 426
The First Triad ... 426
Method ... 427
Historical Setting ... 429
The First Triad (Resumed) ... 431
The Second Triad ... 434
Myth ... 436
The Fourth Triad ... 442
The Final Triad ... 447
Summary & Conclusion ... 452
Epilogue ... 454
Structural Analysis ... 457
Metrical Analysis ... 460
Commentary ... 467

Appendix ... 603
Nemean V ... 605
Nemean III ... 613
Pythian VIII ... 647

Bibliography ... 667

Indices ... 699
Index of Greek Words Discussed ... 701
General Index ... 711

PREFACE

'You ought to make things big. People like it that way.' In spite of Andy Warhol's *dictum*, some readers will no doubt be annoyed by the size of this commentary. As an apology to them I can only say they have never been out of my mind while I was working on this book, first, from 1992, as a Leiden University doctorate dissertation, defended 4 November 1996, and later, while I was bringing it into its present form.

The core of this book is formed by the introduction and the interpretative essays in the three odes commented upon. In the introduction, the reader will find my views on the place of a Pindaric ode in its historical setting, on unity, and on Pindar's style and poetical techniques. The three interpretative essays address the question as to how every single detail in the ode makes sense as a part of a unified specimen of the literary art, composed with the specific purpose of celebrating the glory of a victor for a specifically defined audience at a specific moment in time. The reader who confines himself or herself to these portions of the present book will read the most important things I have to say about Pindar.

The ideal I had in mind for the commentary was to combine the scrutiny of an *instrument de recherche* with the convenient organization of an easy-reference *instrument de lecture.* I tried to approach this ideal by offering all the material necessary in order to substantiate my views in a fair way, while at the same time arranging my notes in such a way that those who are interested only in my interpretation of the general purport of a passage, or in some specific details, can easily find their way. The longer notes begin with my conclusion, which is my proposal of how to interpret the text. My adstruction, following it, has been articulated as much as possible by means of headings. Bold printing of Greek words further articulates the semantic discussions. Moreover, I used two different formats of printing, which, I hope, helps the reader to overlook the sometimes copious notes: everything that is not directly relevant to the understanding of the word or words discussed is printed in nested paragraphs in a smaller font size. Each set of notes on a passage that can be considered to form some kind of self-contained unit is preceded by a translation of the passage, printed in italics. I wish to emphasize that these translations do not pretend to literary merit; their sole object is to serve the convenience of the reader, as the shortest possible

summary of the notes following them. I apologise for the repetitions which this procedure inevitably involves; I preferred being clear to being terse, whenever I found it beyond my capacities to be both at the same time.

This commentary aims at being explanatory as well as descriptive. I do not only devote space to attempts at explaining passages that may elude the immediate understanding of a reader of the Greek text or that have given rise to controversy in the past; it has also been my ambition to describe particularities of Pindar's style and poetic techniques used in the three odes commented upon here.

In spite of its size, the commentary is far from exhaustive. It is my objective to deal with every feature of the Greek text in so far as it is relevant for the interpretation of the text as a whole. As a result, the reader will find a relatively large number of observations bearing on semantics, style, and structure, whereas, e.g., matters related to historical grammar and dialect are discussed only sporadically. I did not want to overload my commentary with references to earlier critics. In many cases I concentrated them in a select bibliography at the end of a note. Although, of course, I have not read everything that could have been helpful to my understanding of various features of Pindar's texts, my omissions are not always based on ignorance, but sometimes on criticism.

Conventions of our trade prevent a commentator from expressing his own personal enthusiasm about the aesthetic qualities of the texts he is commenting upon. Nevertheless, I want my book to contain at least one explicit record of the pleasure I have had in working on Pindar. I never once regretted my choice of author and I have always regarded it as a great privilege to spend all these years with this stunning and magnificently eccentric poetry. I sincerely hope that my attempts at following the conventions of objectivism and at concealing my admiration have not entirely succeded.

In the course of my work on the present commentary I have benefited from various kinds of help which it is a pleasure to record here. My principal debt is to two men of great learning with whom I worked together intensively, to my enormous profit and great pleasure. Professor C.M.J. Sicking of Leiden University combines a superior feeling for Greek language and first-hand acquaintance with Greek texts with an unfailing preparedness to think everything over and over again. Professor Christopher Carey of Royal Holloway University of London combines a profound understanding of Greek literature in general and of Pindar in particular with an admirable capacity of inspiring enthusiasm and new ideas. By their criticisms

and suggestions they have saved me from much error and added greatly to my understanding of a variety of problems; where they have not persuaded me they have almost always led me to reformulate my own position; and I am acutely aware that the defects of the book will lie precisely there where I have been obdurate against their advice.

I wish to express my sincerest gratitude and admiration for my senior colleague, Dr Peter Stork, whose superior understanding of Greek and admirable scrutiny I have been happy to benefit from on many occasions, and whose good humour has always been a source of inspiration. His detailed criticisms on a previous version of this book have saved me from many errors and have made me re-think many issues.

I am very grateful to Professor Andrew Miller for a very lively and inspiring electronic correspondence about the very principles of this book as well as for his copious comments and criticisms on an earlier version of it. I am happy that I have had the occasion to benefit from his superior understanding of Pindar.

Among the many others who generously gave their advice and assistance at different stages of my work on this book I must mention Professor Egbert J. Bakker, Professor R.S.P. Beekes, Frans Blom, Dr Douglas Cairns, Dr Tijn Cuypers, Dr Malcolm Heath, Lilly Knibbeler, Dr Nicholas J. Lowe, Professor Hedvig Maehler, Dr Jan M. van Ophuijsen, Professor Hayden Pelliccia, Professor H.W. Pleket, Dr Marlein van Raalte, Professor Bill Race, Professor S.L. Radt, Professor C.J. Ruijgh, Professoressa Enrica Salvaneschi, Professor Piet H. Schrijvers, Professor Ruth Scodel, Dr H. Singor, Professor S.R. Slings, Dr F.T. van Straten, Professor H.S. Versnel, and Dr Eleni Volonaki. It goes without saying that all remaining flaws and imperfections are solely mine. I wish to thank the staff of the Classics Department of Royal Holloway University of London for their hospitality. It is a pleasure to recall their thriving and energetic institute, which inspired me enormously during my all too short stay there in 1995. I wish to thank Susannah Herman, who undertook the far from unnecessary task of correcting my English. All remaining howlers and batavisms are entirely mine.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to my collega proximus of the Centre for Advanced Pindaric and Xenophontic Studies, Michel Buijs. It was he who would always be the first soundingboard of embryonic ideas, and it was he who must have suffered much more than he would ever admit, by seeing most of our lunches and 'sectieborrels' Pindarized beyond the degree that would be acceptable to anyone.

Finally, I owe more than I can say to Chiara Robbiano, who came into my life as a lasting epiphany on a moment in which both the present book and my life needed some divine inspiration. ἀλλὰ νῦν μοι Γαιάοχος εὐδίαν ὄπαccεν ἐκ χειμῶνοc. I sincerely hope that the present book reveals some of her spirit.

Leiden *December 1998*

INTRODUCTION

The item Pindar in Ross Leckie's invaluable work of reference *Bluff Your Way in the Classics* (Horsham, 1989) reads as follows: "Pindar: Almost untranslatable, usually unintelligible and always inexplicable, he is unfortunately the greatest of Greek lyric poets" (p. xliv). This is not only quite to the point as a summary of Pindar's modern reputation, it also contains in a nutshell the reasons why the history of Pindaric criticism is deplorably unique in so many ways.

Pindar's alleged difficulty[1] is felt especially on the level of the overall compositional organisation of his odes. Every single ode gives the impression of being a variegated conglomerate of disparate parts. Pindar does not make clear explicitly how these different sections cohere. Often he gives the impression that he does not know himself either, and on occasions he himself says that he has no control over his own invention. The difficulty of seeing coherence in Pindar's odes results in all Pindaric interpretation revolving around one central question: unity. And the fact that it is indeed not easy to discover unity in a Pindaric ode is accountable for the history of Pindaric scholarship being a chain of religious wars about method, each new school of interpretation claiming to have found the hidden universal master key to Pindar's odes, making obsolete what has been said about them before and branding any method different from its own as heresy.

The almost universal aesthetic admiration of Pindar's odes accounts for the tenacity of scholars' attempts to discover poetic unity in the apparent diversity and has therefore certainly been a favourable influence on Pindaric scholarship. But it has also had a negative effect, since the desire to appreciate Pindar's odes as poetry, as things of beauty which have something valuable to say to mankind of all time, has led to a tendency to minimalize their occasional character. The unspoken presupposition which has been the basis of much Pindaric exegesis is that true poetry is timeless and that valuable literature is incompatible with the occasional. Efforts have been made to elevate Pindar above the stature of a hireling

[1] At least in the tradition that finds its origin in the ancient scholia. For an illuminating discussion of the history of Pindar's *obscuritas*, see Most, *Measures of Praise*, pp. 11-25.

who celebrates victorious athletes and to demonstrate that his poems transcend the limited occasion of their origin, perhaps indeed more so than to understand exactly how his odes functioned in the context of the victory celebration for which they were written.

The present study takes its starting point from the occasional character of Pindar's odes. My first and foremost aim is to explain how each of the three odes to be discussed functioned as an *epinicion*, composed for the purpose of celebrating a specific victor. It attempts to explain the unity of each of the three odes commented upon. The central question underlying my interpretations of each of the three odes is: how does this ode as a meaningful coherent whole fulfil the encomiastic purpose for which it was composed? The first sections of this introduction will discuss the occasional nature of Pindar's victory odes, the issue of unity, and the relation between the occasional and unity.

The not uncommon impression of Pindar's odes being difficult is to a certain extent a result of a failure to appreciate two characteristic features of Pindar's style, viz. his general tendency towards implicitness and the fictional nature of his break-offs and other first person intrusions into his own discourse, as well as the failure to see a Pindaric ode as a dynamic happening to be perceived by the ear in the dimension of time instead of as a static structure on paper to be read and reread, a failure that makes one insensitive to the continuous interplay between the raising of expectancies of the audience and their subsequent fulfilment, partial fulfilment, or outright frustration. The latter sections of this introduction will address these topics.

The Occasional Nature of Pindar's Odes

Pindar's victory odes are *Gelegenheitsdichtung.* Every single one of them is a response to a specific event: a victory; not a spontaneous response out of personal enthusiasm, but a commissioned one. Every single victory ode is composed for a precisely defined purpose: to enhance the glory of the victor in question. And it was composed to fulfil this purpose in a specific context: as part of celebrations of the victory in the victor's home town, which means that it is designed to function for a specific audience at a specific moment in time.[2]

[2] This is also true for the few odes that were written to be performed at the venue of the victory, a category that certainly includes *O.*11: both ἔνθα (16) and ἀφίξεcθαι (19) imply a distance from the victor's home town (for a different opinion see Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* I, esp. pp. 21-9; for the so-called 'encomiastic' or 'perfor-

Because of the occasional nature of the genre, every single Pindaric victory ode is firmly rooted in its own historical setting.

However, the question as to how and to what extent Pindar's epinicia interact with their historical setting, has often been considered an invalid question, due to a misconception of the nature of Pindar's poetry and to the unfortunate examples of historical analysis that have been undertaken at different stages in the history of Pindaric criticism.

Modern Pindaric criticism started with Boeckh, who practised the method that came to be known as 'historical allegory.' It consists of assuming that the myth is an allegory of something in the victor's life: in order to find unity in a particular Pindaric epinicion, the interpreter needs to make a hypothesis about something that happened (or is about to happen) to the victor similar to an event in the myth, and then check closely through the poem for additional nuances and hints of the hypothetical occurrence. Similarly, L. Schmidt sought to uncover, on the grounds that the epinicia are occasional poetry, a historical situation, an 'Anlaß,' which would explain the content of the ode in question. "The occasion of the victory apparently seemed insufficient grounds for an occasional poem to Schmidt and to many other scholars."[3] The most consequent representative of this tradition was probably Bornemann, who, e.g., explained *N.*7 by supposing that Sogenes, the victor, had been killed by sunstroke.[4] Such historical reconstructions are both unprovable and circular. Moreover, they are arbitrary to the extent that any other plausible conjecture could be substituted for the one argued for, and unnecessary, in so far as such conjectures do not really advance our understanding the odes in the light of the primary aim of the genre, which is to praise the victor.

The historicism of Wilamowitz' *Pindaros* was different. His primary aim was not to understand Pindar's individual poems, but to use them as material for reconstructing the poet's life.[5] The basic idea

---

mative' future, see my *First Person Futures in Pindar*). On this type of odes, see Gelzer, *MH* 42, 1985, 95-120. *O.*11 is in fact the most secure example of this type. Other examples may be *O.*4, B.2, B.4, *I.*3; these have in common with *O.*11 that also a longer ode exists that celebrates the same victory (*O.*5, B.1, *P.*1, *I.*4 respectively). Less certain examples proposed by Gelzer are *O.*14, *P.*6, 7, *N.*2, B.6. See also Willcock on *O.*11 (p. 55).

[3] Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', p. 20.

[4] On the basis that Neoptolemos' death is recorded in the myth in combination with the phrase αἴθωνι πρὶν ἀλίῳ γυῖον ἐμπεσεῖν, 73 (Bornemann, *Philologus* 45, 1886, 596-613, esp. p. 597). See Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', pp. 42-5.

[5] Wilamowitz characterizes his own book as "eine Darstellung [Pindars] Lebens ... von Gedicht zu Gedicht" (*Pindaros*, p. 114).

underlying his approach is the romantic concept of a corpus of poems being a personal log of the poet's life, an idea that is, in a more moderate way, also present in Bowra's *Pindar*. The influence of Wilamowitz' book was tremendous. It has become the symbol of historical approaches of Pindar,[6] which is a very unfortunate distortion—a distortion in sofar as it is not always fully recognized that Wilamowitz' biographical historicism is fundamentally different from those studies that used historical data with the aim of understanding individual odes, and unfortunate because every attempt to understand Pindar's odes in their historical setting is inadvertently associated with Wilamowitz' biographical objective.[7]

The Occasional and the Conventional

Research into the conventions of Pindar's poetry by Schadewaldt, Bundy, Thummer, and others, seemed to deal the death blow to historical and biographical methods. One supposed historical or biographical allusion after another was shown to be a conventional motif or a formalised statement of introduction or transition. Thus, e.g., Schadewaldt rules out the possibility of a historical allusion in *I.*7.16-9 by demonstrating the conventional nature of these lines,[8] and Bundy denies that *O.*11.14 contains a promise of an ampler ode by arguing that the future κελαδήcω is conventional.[9]

If one adopts the basic assumption that conventional themes by their very nature cannot be relevant to the specific historical ambience, one must face the possibility of historical allusions in other passages, which can be proven not to be conventional. This consequence is drawn by Carey, *Five Odes*. The most illustrative example is his approach to *N.*7.102-4, in considering the traditional view that in this passage the poet defends himself against an offensive account of the

---

[6] Recently Cole (*Pindar's Feasts*, p. 9) characterised the tradition he wants to continue as "Wilamowitzean", be it "shorn of its misguided attempt to extract from the epinicians a highly private and personal record of the poet's development as man and artist" (one could ask what is left then), although his historicism is much more sensible and has entirely different aims.

[7] For a pertinent criticism of Wilamowitz' method see Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', pp. 38-42, 52-6.

[8] Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, pp. 9-11 (= 267/9).

[9] Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, I, pp. 21/2. Lee, *CW* 72, 1978, 65-70, argued that Bundy's method does not fundamentally exclude the possibility of historical and topical allusions; but, misunderstood or not, Bundy's monograph certainly had the effect of historical approaches coming to be regarded as a disqualified method.

Neoptolemus myth in *Pae.*6: "as these verses are not conventional (see *ad loc.*), they remain the major obstacle to a refutation of the traditional view and must be taken as autobiographical" (p. 135).

Unconventionality is not the right criterion for the possibility of historical allusion, because conventions and historicity are not incompatible. Whereas it cannot be denied that many themes are dealt with more than once in the Pindaric corpus, and that there are indeed passages that can be called conventional to the extent that they address a theme that also occurs in many other odes, the precise wording of these passages is always unique.[10] Different wording results in different emphasis. Too much sensitivity for conventions in Pindar's odes is dangerous in that it hides the particular from view, and has even proved to be fatal, in that it has, in some cases, resulted in the fallacy that labelling a passage as conventional is the same as explaining it. Conventional passages, too, must contribute to the encomiastic purpose of the particular ode in which they occur and must have relevance to the particular victory that the ode celebrates. Different occurrences of the same conventional theme can have entirely different functions because of the different contexts in which they occur and because of the difference in emphasis resulting from their unique wordings. As every single occurrence of a conventional theme is in this way unique, it is *a priori* entirely possible that its relevance is enhanced by (or even derives from) the historical ambience of the individual ode.

To give one example: labelling καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν | ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν ἐν βαθυπεδίωι Νεμέαι τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει, *N.*3.17/8, as an occurrence of the 'πόνος-motif' is defensible as a short hand for 'this passage has in common with many other passages in the Pindaric corpus that it refers to the hardships of training and competition and presents the victory as a compensation for those.' But this does not relieve the interpreter from the obligation of explaining why such a passage occurs in this ode, why it occurs at this point in the ode, leading over into a statement about the victor having accomplished the highest possible achievement, which in turn leads over into a story about Heracles erecting the Pillars, and why this passage is formulated in precisely these words. The label 'πόνος-motif' in fact veils the differences between this passage and other passages that have got the same label stuck on them, in particular the highly concrete reference to toil as 'fatiguing blows' and the medical terms used to refer to the compensation.

---

[10] See Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 187-95.

It is the double irony of the Pindaric critical history that the question as to how and to what extent Pindar's epinicia interact with their historical setting was disqualified before anyone seriously considered the occasional nature of the epinicia, and that the first one who claimed to do so was more interested in rhetorical stock manoeuvres than in addressing the question of how a specific epinicion interacts with the specific occasion for which it was written. In spite of Bundy's proud and promising claim that "there is no passage in Pindar and Bakkhulides that is not in its primary intent enkomiastic—that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron,"[11] Bundy and his followers failed to appreciate Pindar's odes as *Gelegenheitsdichtung*. By elaborating this promising starting point merely in terms of rhetorical conventions, over-emphasising the typical, they lost sight of the occasional.

The Occasional and Aesthetic Appraisal

The wide impact of Bundy's monograph inevitably led to a counter movement of scholars who did not like the idea of Pindar being an occasional poet who merely varies upon stock rhetorical procedures of the genre. Their aim was to rehabilitate Pindar as a poet, who produced things of beauty and who has something valuable to say to mankind of all times. David C. Young is very fair about this. In his 'Pindaric Criticism' he complains: "Bundy does not present the *epinicia* as literature in the strict sense, for they are not of catholic interest, but are simply and only encomia designed merely to praise specific men to whom the odes were not only dedicated but wholly devoted" (p. 86). The primary aim of his *Three Odes* is "to advance the understanding of the three poems as individual works of the literary art" (p. ix). The unspoken presupposition, which continued to be the basis of many interpretations of Pindar in the Seventies and Eighties, is that true poetry is timeless and that valuable literature is incompatible with the occasional. The aversion against historicism which this presupposition implies was nourished by the strictly text immanent interpretative methods that came into vogue under the influence of 'New Criticism' (only belatedly imported into classical scholarship) and kindred schools of interpretation.

It may be true that many odes contain messages with a general significance that goes far beyond the particular athletic victories they celebrate. However, this does not prove that Pindar conceived of his

---

[11] Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, I p. 3.

own poetry as being detached from the occasional. If we are impressed, e.g., by the beauty or wisdom of 'man's life drives a four-in-hand of excellences and bids us give thought to what lies in front,'[12] our admiration does not relieve us from the obligation to explain the function and relevance of the maxim in its context and in the light of the general purpose of the epinicion in which it occurs. And the main purpose of every single epinicion is to enhance the glory of a specific victor from a specific community, in a specific discipline at specific games under specific circumstances, for a specifically defined audience at a specific moment in time. If, in serving this purpose, Pindar says something of timeless value—and he often does—, that is thrown in with the bargain and we can count our blessings, but it does not go to prove that we are dealing with timeless poetry in the sense of poetry that does not ever respond to topicalities.

The Occasional and the Panhellenic Dimension

Pindar explicitly claims that his odes will travel around the world and spread the fame and glory of the victors they celebrate to their contemporaries abroad (*N.*5.1-6, *O.*9.21-26, *P.*2.67/8, *I.*4.40-2) and he admits to his own Panhellenic ambitions in passages like *O.*1.116/7. These passages suggest that Pindar's victory odes were meant to have an appeal beyond the audience for which they were first performed. It seems to be the *communis opinio* of the most influential Pindaric scholars of our time that Pindar's awareness of a public for each ode beyond the place of its first performance is reflected by a tendency on his part to generalise the victor's achievement, and that this Panhellenic dimension of his odes minimalizes the occasional and practically rules out the possibility of references being made to current political events or specific peculiarities of the victory.[13]

A close look at Pindar's texts proves that this viewpoint does not hold. Some odes refer explicitly to contemporary political events. In *I.*8 there are allusions to the second Persian invasion (5b, 7-15a). In *I.*5.48-50, for an Aeginetan victor, Pindar praises Aegina's contribution to the victory in the battle of Salamis. One could argue that this reference has a Panhellenic dimension to it, although it is made from an entirely Aeginetan perspective. In *O.*12.16, on the other hand, the poet refers to ϲτάϲιϲ in Cnossos, an event that has much

[12] Bowra's translation of *N.*3.74/5.

[13] Thus, e.g., Carey, 'Pindar and the Victory Ode' in *The Passionate Intellect*, pp. 90-2.

relevance to the victor, but that cannot possibly have raised much of a Panhellenic interest. The same is true for *N.*9.40, where Pindar mentions the victor's role in the battle of Helorus of 492 B.C., and for *I.*7.24-37, where Pindar devotes a large, central portion of his ode to the victor's uncle who fell in battle. Contemporary Sicilian events loom large in *P.*1. Pindar refers to the eruption of the Etna that began in 479 B.C. (lines 21-9), to the battle of Himera (480 B.C.), in which Hieron and his brother Gelon defeated the Carthaginians, and to the battle of Cumae (474 B.C.), in which they defeated a coalition of Carthaginians and Etruscans (lines 71-80, mentioning also Salamis and Plataea). Pindar refers to the founding of Etna in 476 B.C., and to the establishment of Hieron's son Deinomenes as its ruler (lines 31/2, 58-70).

Moreover, Pindar's odes contain numerous references that must have been perfectly lucid to the audiences of their first performances, but that are too concise to have been intelligible to contemporaries in other city states. These include allusions to family ties,[14] localities in the victor's city,[15] local cults,[16] and local versions of mythical stories.[17] Another indication that Pindar primarily had his first audience in mind when composing his odes is his usage of deictic references from a perspective of the first performance.[18] Similarly, Pindar's temporal perspective is generally that of the time of the first performance.[19] All this suggests quite the opposite of Pindar's envisaging a Panhellenic audience. It proves that Pindar, as

---

[14] The odes for Lampon's son present some examples: Themistius' relation to Pytheas and Phylacidas is not revealed by the poet at all. We need the scholia to tell us that he was their mother's father. A non-Aeginetan audience would have had no clue whatsoever why he is mentioned in *N.*5.50 and *I.*6.65. In *O.*8, we are totally left in the dark about the relationship of Timosthenes, Iphion, and Callimachus to the victor Alcimedon (see Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 1-6). In *N.*6, Pindar does not bother to make clear explicitly that Callias and Creontidas (34-44) were Praxidamas' brothers and Soclidas' sons (23/4; see Carey, *ibid.* 7-9).

[15] Examples include references to the Aeginetan Thearion in *N.*3.70, the shrine of Aeacus in *N.*5.53, the description of Sogenes' house in *N.*7.93/4, the warm water springs in Himera at *O.*12.19, the Theban Ismenion in *P.*11.4-6, the Electrae gate at Thebes in *I.*4.61.

[16] Examples include the reference to the Theoxenia involving the Dioscuri and Helen in *O.*3; the reference to the Cyrenaean Carnea in *P.*5 (see Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 19 n. 70; Robbins, *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, p. 220; Verdenius, *Commentaries* I p. 6; and esp. Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon*), the Herakleia at Thebes in *I.*4 (see Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon*; Willcock *ad loc.*, pp. 85-6).

[17] Examples include Pamphaes hosting Castor and Polydeukes in *N.*10.49/50.

[18] Examples include αὐτόθεν in *N.*5.20 and *N.*3.64, ἔνθα in *O.*11.16. Similarly, words like οἴκοι and οἰκόθεν are always used from the perspective of the audience of the first performance (*P.*8.65, *N.*3.31, *N.*5.45, *N.*2.23, *O.*6.99, *O.*3.44, *I.*4.12).

[19] *Pace* Young, *HSCP* 87, 1983, 40-2; see Carey, *Tria Lustra*, p. 97 n. 3, with many examples.

a rule, accommodates himself to the knowledge and perspective of his first audience, allowing himself to be concise about data familiar to them, and that he does not bother to explain what must have been unclear or unfamiliar to potential subsequent audiences in other parts of Greece.

Also Pindar's general *ethos* is precisely the opposite of what we would expect of a professional Panhellenic poet. His odes are suffused with a spirit of intimacy. Pindar places a great deal of emphasis on his personal bond with his patron and with his audience.[20] He insists on a relation of *xenia* between himself and his patron on many occasions.[21] Occasionally he goes further and represents his relationship with the victor as one of *philia*,[22] or even as an actual family tie.[23] As has been demonstrated recently by Carey (*Passionate Intellect*, pp. 94/5), the vigour of Pindar's personal commitment is especially clear when it is contrasted with the way in which Bacchylides addresses similar topics. In contrast with the "brief and colourless reference to *xenia*" in B.5.11, the lines describing Pindar' personal ties with the victor in *P.*10.64-6 are charged with emotion, emphasising "trust (πέποιθα), kindness (ἐμὰν ποιπνύων χάριν), zeal (προφρόνως), friendship (φιλέων φιλέοντ')[24] and reciprocity (ἄγων ἄγοντα)" (Carey, *loc. cit.*, who further discusses *N.*7.61 ff. and *P.*4.299 as similar charged and poignant references to the poet's personal bonds with the victor).

This atmosphere of intimacy could, of course, be fictional,[25] comparable to the fiction of spontaneity (see below) in that the poet tries to hide the mercantile nature of his poetry and his own status as a professional hireling, "substituting intimacy for formality and friendship for the coldness of the contractual relationship."[26] An affirmative answer to the question whether Pindar's expressed personal concerns for his commissioner and first audience are fictional, does

---

[20] An example is *I.*8.15b-8, where Pindar emphasises his own personal link with Aegina by referring to the mythical relationship between Aegina and Thebes. Similarly, Pindar may emphasise his commitment to the mythical heroes of the victor's city, as in *I.*5.20, *I.*6.19 ff. Cf. also *N.*5.46/7 with my note *ad loc.* (pp. 176/7).

[21] Cf., e.g., *O.*1.11 ff., *P.*3.69, *P.*10.64 ff., *N.*1.19 ff., *N.*7.61, *I.*2.48. See also my note on *N.*5.8 φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν (pp. 111/2).

[22] Cf. *P.*1.92, *P.*4.1, and *N.*3.76 with my note *ad loc.* (pp. 396-8).

[23] Cf. *I.*1.1 ff. and *I.*7.37 ff., for Theban victors. Cf. esp. *O.*6.84 ff. for a Sicilian victor (see Carey, *Passionate Intellect*, p. 94).

[24] See also my note on *P.*8.13/4 (p. 491).

[25] "One effect of this emphasis on personal relantionships is to create an illusion of intimacy, both between poet and audience and between poet and patron," Carey, *Passionate Intellect*, p. 95.

[26] Carey, *Passionate Intellect*, p. 95.

not support the view that Pindar is in fact addressing a Panhellenic audience so as to minimalize the occasional and exclude references to current political events or specific peculiarities of the victory. These could be part of this same fiction. The poet's 'pretending' to be the victor's close friend, his 'pretending' to accommodate himself to the knowledge and views of his first audience, his 'pretending' to share their interest in topicalities, and his 'pretending' to take their side in an international conflict (as in *N.*5) are all on a sliding scale. And the question whether this is in fact false pretence brings us to the core of Pindar's profession. We cannot possibly tell whether Pindar's personal concern was genuine. All we can say is that a hired occasional poet is more likely to express his commissioner's viewpoint at the cost of his own than *vice versa.*

All this amounts to a situation that is far more complex than the current *communis opinio* would make us believe. What we have, is a poet whose primary concern is to compose odes that fulfil their encomiastic aims in the context of their first performance, writing from the perspective of his first audience, while at the same time fully realising the Panhellenic potential of his art. The impact of a Pindaric ode on subsequent audiences can be compared to a pebble that is thrown into a pond, causing concentric circles of rippling water, the intensity of which decreases the further away one gets from the centre. An ode had the deepest significance for its first audience attending the official celebration for which it was written. They knew the victor and his family, they could be expected to have heard about the circumstances of the victory, and they were able to understand the references or allusions to these circumstances and to topicalities of great interest to them. Subsequent audiences would have missed most of these references. They would have appreciated Pindar's odes as poems about success and failure in general. The more an audience would have lost affinity with the athletic and aristocratic ideals of Pindar's commissioners, the more their appreciation would be confined to the purple patches and bravura openings.[27]

Whereas most recent studies on Pindar, which do in fact attempt to interpret his odes as poems about success and failure in general, detaching them from their original historical ambience as much as possible, may be said to aim at reconstructing how Pindar's odes

---

[27] Five such passages (ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, *O.*1.1; νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς, *fr.*169a; ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι ... Ἀθᾶναι, *fr.*76; σύνες ὅ τι λέγω, *fr.*105; τί κάλλιον ἀρχομένοισιν ἢ καταπαυομένοισιν, *fr.*89a) account for nearly all the allusions found in pre-Hellenistic writers. See Irigoin, *Histoire*, pp. 11-26; Cole, *Pindar's Feasts*, p. 15 with n. 8.

could have been perceived by a Panhellenic audience—an aim that is in itself entirely legitimate, provided it is fully recognized as such—, it is my objective to try and understand how each of the three odes commented upon fulfilled its encomiastic aims in the context of its first performance, reconstructing its full impact on its first audience.

Modern Historicism

The relevance of the social and political context of the performance of the Pindaric victory odes for their interpretation is gradually given more attention in modern studies. As far as it can be observed now, the relevance of the historical setting is recognised by two major schools of interpretation. The first is what I would call the 'historical' school of interpretation. Many of its representatives are to be found in Urbino, in the circle around Bruno Gentili, including Paola Angeli Bernardini (*Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro*, Rome 1983) and Thomas Cole (*Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power*, Rome 1992).

The second movement is what I would call the 'anthropological' school of interpretation. Scholars representing this school are not so much interested in the specific historical and social circumstances of the performance of each single ode, as determined by time and place of the performance and the social position of the victor or the commissioner, but in the general connections between epinician poetry and archaic Greek rituals and social conventions. Exponents of this new 'anthropological historicism' are: Kevin Crotty (*Song and Action. The Victory Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore & London 1982), who is engaged in themes like the victory as a combination of joy and toil, φιλότηϲ, and the ode as a means of securing the successful return home of the victor from the games; and most recently Leslie Kurke (*The Traffic in Praise, Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca [N.Y.] 1991), who seeks to provide a 'sociological poetics' (p. 9) of Pindar's epinicia, to determine how the poetry relates to the different groups within his audience, and to explore the poetry in the context of traditional patterns of gift exchange. This new 'anthropological historicism' explores the texts in the light of a set of models which produce different emphases. Though it is useful to have Pindar so squarely placed in the values and beliefs of his society, these studies suffer from the rigidity of the pre-imposed models.[28] Apart from that the case for a model is often overstated, one would

[28] Cf. Carey's review of Kurke in *JHS* 114, 1994, 184.

wish for the interpretative method to be guided by the problems posed by the individual texts rather than to see the texts used to illustrate the pre-imposed model. These books do less to advance our understanding of individual odes as unified wholes, than to demonstrate the validity of their models by applying them to Pindar's odes. These objections apply less to Eveline Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (I4, P5, O1 und 3)*, Berlin 1990. Although she has in common with the representatives of the 'anthropological' school that she is more interested in the historical ambience of the odes viewed as a continuum of social and religious values[29] than in their interaction with specific current events, her aim is to arrive at an integrated interpretation of individual odes.

The present study shares with Bernardini, Cole, Krummen, Crotty, and Kurke the conviction that Pindar's odes are, because of their occasional nature, firmly rooted in their historical setting, and that the historical, social, and political context of their first performance cannot be ignored. It differs, however, from the latter two in seeking to understand individual odes in their own specific setting. And it goes further than the studies of Bernadini, Cole, and Krummen, in that it does not only seek to reconstruct the historical setting of individual odes but also attempts to explain how the individual odes functioned as *epinicia* within the context of their historical setting, and how they did so as coherent wholes.

Unity

More than one and a half centuries of modern Pindaric criticism, which unsuccessfully sought to uncover the unity of Pindar's poems by means of several monolithic interpretative theories, have taught us the lesson that there is no such thing as 'Pindar's secret'. The presumption that each of Pindar's poems conceals some paraphrasable one-dimensional basic meaning hidden by Pindar in his poems in accordance with some consistent process, which, once discovered, provides the key to what he really means to say, has proved to be false. Be it the concept of the 'Grundgedanke' (Dissen), 'historical al-

[29] Krummen states her objective as follows: "Das primäre Ziel dieser Untersuchung besteht also darin, die jeweils relevanten Textpassagen und die Kommunikationsbedingungen in der aktuellen Situation der Siegesfeier zu erläutern, und zwar sowohl hinsichtlich der Rahmenbedingungen, als auch ... der mythisch-kulturellen 'Erwartung'" (p. 9).

legory' (Boeckh), the theory of recurrent words or syllables being the key to the basic meaning (Mezger, Bury, Norwood, Newman & Newman), Schadewaldt's 'dual unity' consisting in the interaction between 'objektiver und subjektiver Zweck,' Norwood's 'unifying symbol,' more sophisticated symbolism as advocated by Finley and Duchemin, Bundy's rhetorical conventions (adopted and modified by Thummer, Slater, and others), or Hubbard's 'structurations of polarity'[30]—none of these methods has proven to be the universal master key to our understanding of single odes. The search for simple answers and short cuts for Pindaric interpretation must be abandoned.

On the other hand, the basic assumption of critics like Hermann, Romagnoli, Wilamowitz, Drachmann, Dornseiff, Perotta, Farnell, Fränkel, and Verdenius, that there is no such thing as unity in Pindar's poems, has the disadvantage of relieving one from the obligation to try and understand how a single ode makes sense as a whole.[31] It also ignores the point that there *is* an obvious unity centring on victor and victory. As soon as one ascribes one's own shortcomings in understanding the unity to inconsistencies of the poet, the very possibility of ever understanding anything disappears.[32]

The tool used by Bundy and his school in order to deal with the issue of unity in Pindar's odes is the concept of 'foil.' Passages in the

---

[30] Full references to the works of the critics mentioned are to be found in the Bibliography (pp. 667-98). For a thorough and enlightening overview of the history of Pindaric criticism upto and including Bundy, see Young, 'Pindaric Criticism'. For an excellent discussion from a more theoretical point of view see Most, *Measures of Praise*, pp. 11-59.

[31] The concept of unity of the entire corpus, as being one long poem about one basic idea ("Wert", Fraenkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*; Gundert, *Dichterberuf*), a series of consistent symbols (Finley, *Pindar and Aeschylus*; Duchemin, *Poète et prophète*) or as a poetic personal log (Coppola, *Introduzione*; and basically also Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*) is inconsistent with the occasional nature of epinicians. Pindar's poetry is frequently used as a source for the history of *Weltanschauung*, sociology, or religion. This is, of course, perfectly legitimate, provided that it is realised that we are dealing with poetry here, not with records or philosophocal treatises, and, more importantly, that we are dealing with separate poems, each of them written for its own specific occasion and for a specific audience, which does not *a priori* justify the presumption that Pindar is consistent throughout the corpus that has come down to us.

[32] An example is Wilamowitz' 'analysis' of the gnomic passage in *N.*3.40-2: "Dann kommt sein Bruder Telamon mit seinen bekannten Heerfahrten; an ihn wird ziemlich gewaltsam der Spruch aus Ol. 2, 86 geknüpft; es drängte den Pindar, seinen Glauben an die Überlegenheit der Begabung über alle angelernte Kunst auch hier zu bekennen.", Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 280. The basic assumption that there is no unity relieves Wilamowitz from the obligation to explain the function of the passage in its context. If he had felt this obligation he would certainly have noticed that one of the most obvious functions of the passage is to link the two generations of Aeacids whose stories surround it.

odes that were before regarded as irrelevant are now apparently saved from the accusation of being irrelevant by calling them 'foils.' This entails the subordination of elements which Pindar merely juxtaposes, to the effect that "for accidental irrelevance, the spontaneous outpourings of the garrulous poet who inhabited the odes before Bundy's monograph appeared, we are given contrived irrelevance. But the irrelevance is still there."[33] When a certain passage is treated as 'preparatory foil' without thematic significance, it contributes little to the avowed aim of the victory ode, which is to praise the victor. Thus Bundy and his school not only do fail to fulfil their promise that their methods demonstrate there is no passage in Pindar that is not in its primary content encomiastic, they also fail to describe the odes as unified wholes, in which every detail makes sense.

Post-Bundian Pindaric criticism has developed more sophisticated concepts of poetic unity. Young rightly insisted poetic unity is not an *aliud maius*: "In a unified ode, all the passages do not have in common a single, paraphrasable 'thought'; they have in common an interest in each other. Furthermore, the passages of the ode are not bound together by a single thought, but are bound together to make a single thought, which is the ode." (Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', p. 35).[34] The seventies and eighties have brought us in abundance the kind of approach to Pindar that was so vehemently desired by Young. Along the lines of 'New Criticism' and kindred schools of interpretation, Pindar's odes were interpreted as individual works of the literary art, as *Sprachkunstwerke*, detached from the historical and social environment which produced them. The text immanent method of interpreting individual odes reached its *acme* in Glenn Most's *Measures of Praise*. He draws the ultimate conclusion from Young's holism and demands that the unity sought is exhaustive,

---

[33] Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 155. Cf. also Young's pertinent criticism: "The foil is always said to be 'dismissed' after it has served the purpose of attracting attention to the subject of interest. Most of Pindar is, in Bundy's terms, foil, and such an attitude creates a major problem. Even if we grant that a major part of Pindar is foil, we must still ask the question: Why did Pindar choose these specific passages to serve as foil in this specific poem? When this question is asked, the whole concept of foil which is to be dismissed seems useless. Surely we cannot assume that the opening priamels of Olympians 1 and 2 could be interchanged with no injury to the two poems." ('Pindaric Criticism', p. 87). See also Most, *Measures of Praise*, pp. 26-36.

[34] "Un certain entrelacement d'images et de pensées qui s'apellent les unes les autres comme les notes d'un chant, qui se complètent et se corrigent entre elles, peut laisser dans l'âme de l'auditeur ou du lecteur une impression difficile peut-être à formuler avec précision par les procedés logiques et abstraits de la prose, mais néanmoins nette et profonde." (A. Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare*, Paris 1880, 330).

that no single detail is excluded from the overall compositional organisation, and that the unity sought is systematic, that the various inter-relations discovered are not independent, but themselves inter-related and coherently organised (p. 47). The strictly text-internal approach has brought to light many interesting cross references within one and the same ode, inter-twinings of images and ideas, and similar observations which help to close the gap between Pindar and modern European poetry. These studies advanced our understanding of poetic unity. They brought the awareness that the unity of a poem is a manifold concept, depending on many contributing factors, some more easily described than others;[35] they did away with mono-functionalism and restrictive privileging in that they demonstrated convincingly that most details in a Pindaric ode have many different functions which all contribute to the ode's unity on different levels.

However, these approaches fall short in as much as they detach Pindar's odes from the occasional. The model of strict text-internality is fundamentally inapplicable to Pindar, because each of his victory odes owes its very existence to a text external circumstance: an athletic victory. The purpose of every single ode is text-external: to enhance the glory of the victor. Pindar's odes are not poems that exist for their own sake; they are composed to function in the context of an official public celebration of a victory. The unity of a Pindaric ode cannot be severed from the ode's occasional nature.

Unity and the Occasional

The basic assumption underlying the strictly text immanent interpretations of Pindar is that text external references are incompatible with poetic unity. D.C. Young makes this assumption the starting point of his *Three Odes:* "Most Pindaric critics have assumed that *The Epinician Odes* contain numerous topical allusions which serve Pindar's personal aims more than they suit the encomiastic and literary purposes of the poems in which they occur. From this common assumption result two others; namely that many Pindaric odes lack essential poetic unity and that Pindar frequently uses the epinician to attack his competitors, to defend himself against sundry critics, and to publish his personal and political censures and loyalties" (*Three Odes*, p. 1). I agree entirely with his point that "any personal

[35] Young, *Three Odes*, successfully ventured to validate this thesis.

reference unrelated to the rest of the poem makes perfect unity impossible" (*Three Odes*, p. 1 n. 1) and that the idea of Pindar expressing his personal views without relevance to the encomiastic purpose of the ode is wrong. Encomiastic purpose is the key issue here. Young's very precise formulation does not exclude the possibility of Pindar's odes containing topical allusions that contribute to the encomiastic and literary purposes of the poems in which they occur.

A consequence of this concept is that I do not exclude the possibility of some of the various parts of an ode deriving some of their layers of relevance from text external circumstances. In some cases, this is entirely obvious. All Aeacids myths in the Aeginetan odes have in common that they derive part of their relevance from the fact that they enhance the glory of Aegina; so at least one of the layers of their relevance is derived from the text external circumstance that the victor comes from Aegina. Two of the layers of relevance of the Heracles myth in *N.*3.22-6 are text external: Heracles' physical qualities are by no means out of place in an ode for a pancration victor. Moreover, he was the founder of the Nemean games. In other cases, various parts of an ode may derive some of their layers of relevance from unique text external circumstances, which are not entirely obvious and which may even in a greater or lesser degree be hypothetical (and will therefore be controversial in a greater or lesser degree). Thus, e.g., the opening hymn to Hesychia in *P.*8 derives much of its relevance from the specific political situation in Aegina in 446 B.C. This type of text external relevance is fundamentally different from the other examples mentioned from a methodological point of view. The text external data to which it relates are hypothetical. It should, however, be noted that there is no difference whatsoever between the two types of text external relevance from the perspective of Pindar's contemporary audience. If indeed the contemporary political situation as reconstructed is a reality to the audience, it is as much so as their Aeginetan origin and Heracles' link with Nemea. It is the interpreter's task to try and minimalize the degree of conjecture, to corroborate his hypotheses as much as possible when he needs them, in short to do what a critic must always do—but there is no reason whatsoever to assume that references to political events cannot possibly occur in Pindar's odes. And Young is certainly right in demanding from the interpreter that he makes exactly clear how these text external references fit into the overall literary organisation of the ode in which they occur and how they contribute to its encomiastic purpose.

With regard to the question of unity, the present study may be regarded as continuing in the general tradition represented, among

others, by Young, Köhnken, Carey, and Most,[36] to the extent that it shares their basic assumptions that there is such a thing as poetic unity of a Pindaric ode, which means that the various parts of the poem, on the largest as well as the smallest scale, have a mutual interest in each other; that their sum is a meaningful, coherent whole; that unity of a Pindaric ode is a manifold concept, depending on many contributing factors, some more easily described than others; that various parts of the poem more often than not have a multiple relevance; and that the unity of an ode is more often than not a complex and subtle interplay of various inter-relations.

My concept of unity differs, however, from that of the scholars mentioned in its consequent super-ordinance of encomiastic purpose. The unity discovered must contribute to the encomiastic aims of the ode in the specific context of its first performance. These aims provide a touchstone, or are at least constitutive of a hierarchy in all the factors the interpreter discerns as contributing to the unity of a poem. To give an example: an analysis of *N*.5 in terms of recurrent variations upon the contrasting themes arrest and movement[37] can never in itself be an adequate description of the poetic unity of *N*.5 because such a structure does not contribute to enhancing the glory of Pytheas of Aegina, winner of the Nemean pancration contest in 487 B.C. (or an interpreter who wants to argue that such a structure constitutes the unity of *N*.5 has the obligation to explain how it does); and if such a structure is accepted as one of the factors contributing to a general feeling of unity of *N*.5, it is a factor on a hierarchically low level, forming at best one of the undertows of continuity. As a contrast, the recurrent variations upon the contrasting themes light and dark in *N*.3 contribute to the unity of the ode on a high level, because of their consequent association with fame and failure which is linked with inheritance, their helping to associate the victor with Achilles, and to suggest consequently that the victor's recent success was nothing less than a continuation of the qualities of his illustrious ancestors, a suggestion that contributes directly to enhancing the glory of the victor.

Most, in his *Measures of Praise*, says the following about unity: "the unity sought is both exhaustive (i.e., such that no part of the poem, however small, is excluded from the general organisation) and systematic (i.e., such that the various inter-relations discovered are not independent of one another, but instead are themselves inter-related

---

[36] Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', *Three Odes, Isthmian 7*. Köhnken, *Funktion des Mythos* (see esp. p. 18). Carey, *Five Odes*. Most, *Measures of Praise* (see esp. pp. 47/8).
[37] J. Stern, 'The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5, *CPh* 66, 1971, 169-173.

and coherently organised)" (p. 47). For me, Most's "systematic unity" resides in the encomiastic purpose of the ode. All the various inter-relations discovered are not independent of one another, but instead contribute to enhancing the glory of the victor in the context of the public celebration of his victory.

My concept of the ideal at which the interpreter must aim is a situation in which he can explain how every single detail in a specific ode makes sense as a part of a unified whole that contributes to enhancing the glory of the specific victor from the specific community, victorious in his specific discipline at the specific games under the specific circumstances, and celebrated for the specifically defined audience at the specific moment in time.

Method

Admitting the possibility of some parts of the odes deriving their relevance from text external circumstances raises a question of method. We rarely have independent evidence about the precise historical setting of the performance of a Pindaric ode. So how are we to avoid the circular and conjectural reasoning of nineteenth century historicism?

A certain degree of circularity cannot possibly be avoided. A reconstruction of the historical setting of an ode will always be hypothetical to some extent. But the situation is relatively favourable in the case of the Aeginetan odes. We know relatively much about the archaic history of Aegina. Moreover, the great number of odes by Pindar and Bacchylides for Aeginetan victors enables us to form a relatively complete picture of the social values of the archaic Aeginetan aristocracy. These verifiable historical data minimalize the extent of circularity and conjecture which a hypothesis about the historical setting of an ode inevitably involves. The main criterion for the validity of such a hypothetical reconstruction is economy of interpretation. The more a hypothesis about the historical setting of an ode enables one to understand passages that remain inexplicable without it, the more likely it is to be true.

Pythian VIII is a good example. The ode opens with a lengthy address to Hesychia, tranquility, and the way in which she is described (1-4) leaves no doubt that she is the representation of a political idea; and to her the victory is dedicated (5). This is a clear indication that Pindar responds to current political events, and that he, in fact, has chosen to present them as interrelated with the victory. The ode can be securely dated to 446 B.C.; we have verifiable historical data

about the temporary crumbling of the Athenian empire as a result of the Athenian defeat at Coronea in 447 B.C. It is possible to make sense of the invocation of Hesychia, of the dedication of the victory to her, and of some other much disputed passages of the ode, with the help of certain hypotheses, derived from and consistent with the known historical facts, with respect to the probable consequences the current events had for the internal political situation on the one hand, and for the relation between Aegina and Athens on the other. If these hypotheses are consistent with the verifiable historical data and, at the same time, help to explain passages in this ode which remain obscure without them, they surpass mere speculation by virtue of their double applicability, which may be taken as an indication of their validity.

The situation for *Nemean* V is comparable. Many features of the text elude our understanding as long as we are unwilling to take into account that the ode was performed while Aegina was at war with Athens. This is a hypothesis, of course, not a fact, because the dates of both this ode and the Athenian-Aeginetan war are disputed. And it is a hypothesis that is formed on the basis of Pindar's text in order to explain his text, so there is certainly an element of circularity. But it is a hypothesis for which arguments can be adduced: Herodotus describes such a war; there are good arguments in favour of assuming this war reached its peak in 487 B.C., as there are good arguments in favour of dating the ode to that year. Certain peculiarities in Herodotus' description of the war help to explain certain peculiarities of the text of *N.*5 (the role played by the Aeginetan exile Nicodromus helps to explain why exile is a theme in this ode and why much emphasis is laid upon internal Aeginetan solidarity). Bacchylides' thirteenth ode commemorates the same victory as this ode, and confirms the hypothesis that both were performed during the war. These independent sources minimalize the degree of circularity. Most importantly, the hypothesis explains certain peculiarities of the text of *N.*5 that cannot be explained without it. Anyone who is dissatisfied with the degree of conjecture that this hypothesis inevitably involves is challenged to explain the strikingly harsh treatment of the Athenian trainer Menander in 48-50, the poet's statement in lines 46/7, and the reference to 'iron-clad war' in line 19.

The case of *Nemean* III is different. There is no reason to assume that this ode alludes to current political events. However, there are a few passages in this ode which cannot satisfactorily be explained with an entirely text internal method. The ode contains quite a few undisputed explicit references to peculiarities of the specific victory it commemorates. ὀψέ περ in line 80 makes clear that some delay oc-

curred in the poet's delivery of the ode. The ode was probably performed at the anniversary of the victory (line 2). Lines 69/70 say the victor was made a member of the Thearion; the syntax suggests this happened as a direct result of his victory. Taking the reference to 'a cure against fatiguing blows' (17/8) literally instead of as just another occurrence of an epinician stock motif, accounting for its specificity rather than observing its similarity with other passages, gives rise to the hypothesis that the victor was severely injured. Accounting for the close link of this reference with the *ne plus ultra* motif in the following lines, instead of regarding the two as unrelated conventional themes which could have been mentioned anywhere in the ode, suggests he had to put an end to his athletic career because of that. This hypothesis cannot be corroborated with the help of independent sources. The criterion of economy of interpretation is the only argument we have in this case. The hypothesis has the advantage of explaining the relevance of the Heracles story, which has not been satisfactorily explained before, and of enabling one to understand that the allegedly obscure gnomic passage in 70-5 is word for word relevant to the victor; more precisely, it enables us to understand that these two passages are highly complimentary to the victor, as one would expect in the light of the encomiastic aims of the genre. If my hypothesis is proven to be wrong, or if more can be explained with another hypothesis, or if the same or more can be explained without any hypothesis, I will be the first to admit that my interpretation of the ode has been refuted.

My selection of odes is meant to be illustrative of my method, in that it includes two examples of odes interacting with political events, relevant to the victor's society as a whole, and one example of an ode that responds to peculiarities of the specific victory. The former two exemplify two different ways in which independent sources contribute to our understanding of the odes: in the case of both *N.*5 and *P.*8 we have known historical data; the difference is that in the case of *N.*5 we are dealing with known data that are not known to be connected with the ode, whereas in the case of *P.*8 the historical data are known to be connected with the ode. *N.*3 illustrates my method in the case of an absence of such sources. Moreover the reader will be aware that my selection is meant to be persuasive as far as the issue of historicity is concerned. I suspect that some of Pindar's victory odes do not interact with their historical setting to a much larger extent than that they refer to the specific victories they commemorate (although I cannot think of an example of which I am absolutely sure). Obviously, such odes can be satisfactorily explained without the help of hypotheses concerning

current political events or specific peculiarities of the victory. However, I wish to take a strong stand against the presupposition that it is inconceivable that Pindar ever responds to current events, that we ought never to look outside the text for answers, and that a purely text internal interpretative method is the only sound approach to every single Pindaric ode. This fallacy originates from a justified fear of speculation, combined with a concept of Pindar's poetry that does not square with the very nature of the genre or with Pindar's practice.

PINDAR'S STYLE

ΠΟΙΚΙΛΙΑ

ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων
ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλιςςα θύνει λόγον.
*P.*10.54/5.

Probably the most stunning feature of nearly every single ode of Pindar is its diversity. His odes are variegated artefacts combining a multitude of disparate, seemingly unconnected themes, stories, *gnomae*, and data in an unpredictable sequence. The kind of ποικιλία Pindar is aiming at is structural diversity that results from the use of different kinds of material. Like a bee darts from one flower to another, in an unpredictable pattern, only concerned for what it needs, nectar, the best part of the flower, and then shooting off to another, Pindar's odes hasten from one theme to another, in an unpredictable sequence, dealing only with the essence of every theme or story, and then moving on to another.

The idea of Pindar's odes being a composition of a number of different ingredients forming one variegated whole is explicitly stated or hinted at in many passages: Μοῖςά τοι | κολλᾶι χρυςὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἁμᾶ | καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίας ὑφελοῖς' ἐέρςας, *N.*7.77-9; ὑφαίνω δ' Ἀμυθαονίδαιςιν ποικίλον ἄνδημα, *fr.*179; εἶα τειχίζωμεν ἤδη ποικίλον | κόςμον αὐδάεντα λόγων, *fr.*194.2/3; φόρμιγγα... ποικιλόγαρυν, *O.*3.8; ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς, *O.*4.2; πλέκων | ποικίλον ὕμνον, *O.*6.86/7; ποικίλον κιθαρίζων, *N.*4.14; ποικίλων...ὕμνων, *N.*5.42; ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολυμύθοι· | βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖςι ποικίλλειν | ἀκόνα cοφοῖς· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως | παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν, *P.*9.76-9; Μοῖςα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μιςθοῖο ςυνέθευ παρέχειν | φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαι ταραςςέμεν, *P.*11.41/2. Cf. also the image of the 'cocktail of song' in *N.*3.77-9 (with my notes *ad loc.*, pp. 398-9).

Ancient literary criticism recognizes diversity as an aesthetic aim in itself. Aristotle values ποικιλία because variety is pleasant, refreshing, and retentive of interest and attention whereas uniformity is dull.[38] Dionysius praises the ποικιλία of Herodotus.[39] Plutarch in his treatise *How to Listen to Poets* comments upon ποικιλία in poetry: ἄνευ δὲ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς μάλιςτα μὲν ἡ ποιητικὴ τῶι ποικίλωι χρῆται καὶ πο-

---

[38] Arist.*Poet.*59a34, 59b26-31, *Rhet.*1371a25/6 (quoting E.*Or.*234).
[39] ἡδὺ χρῆμα ... ἡ μεταβολὴ καὶ ποικίλον, D.H.*ad Pomp.*3.11 (II 236.9-15 U-R).

λυτρόπωι. τὸ γὰρ ἐμπαθὲς καὶ παράλογον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον, ὧι πλείστη μὲν ἔκπληξις ἕπεται πλείστη δὲ χάρις, αἱ μεταβολαὶ παρέχουσι τοῖς μύθοις (Plut.*Mor.*25d). He says that poetry makes special use of τὸ ποικίλον, because changes and surprise produce the greatest ἔκπληξις, and therefore the greatest pleasure.[40]

Implicitness

Implicitness in the Macro-Structure

Pindar's alleged difficulty is felt especially on the level of the overall compositional organisation of his odes. Most odes give the impression of being a variegated conglomerate of disperse parts. Pindar often does not make clear explicitly how these different sections cohere.

Pindar's myths are a clear example. The use of myth as an exemplum had been well established long before Pindar's time. It is known from Homer, Alcaeus, Sappho, Theognis, and Tyrtaeus.[41] These early examples have in common with Pindar's use of myths that they are treated briefly, and opportunistically, giving only the relevant details, and relying heavily upon the audience's familiarity with the story. The major difference is that these early poets as a rule make clear explicitly what the relevance of the mythical exemplum is.[42] Cf., e.g., νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου. | καὶ γάρ τ' ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου, *Il.*24.601/2, introducing the exemplum, and ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα, δῖε γεραιέ, | σίτου, 618/9, restating the relevance after the exemplum has been given. Cf. also παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεί ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους ..., Thgn.1345, introducing the exemplum, and οὕτω μὴ θαύμαζε Σιμωνίδη, οὕνεκα κἀγὼ | ἐξεφάνην καλοῦ παιδὸς ἔρωτι δαμείς, 1349/50, driving home the point for those who may have missed it. Cf. also μή με κακῶν μίμνησκε· πέπονθά τοι οἷά τ' Ὀδυσσεύς, | ὅς ..., Thgn.1123/4; ἀλλά σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, ὥς ποτέ φασιν | Ἰασίου κούρην ..., Thgn.1287/8, etc.

Pindar as a rule does not say anything as explicit in order to guide his audience in their understanding of the relevance of the myth.

---

[40] Cf. also Plut.*Mor.*504d. On ποικιλία in ancient literary criticism, see further Heath, *Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, pp. 105/6; *Unity in Greek Poetics*, Oxford 1989. On ποικιλία in Pindar see also Maehler, *Dichterberuf*, pp. 70, 90.

[41] Cf., e.g., *Il.*9.524-605, 24.602-20; Alc.*fr.*38A, 42 V.; Sapph.*fr.*16, 17 V.; Thgn.702 ff., 1123-8, 1231-4, 1283-94, 1345-9; Tyrt.12.

[42] See also Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 8.

Normally he introduces his myth in a very casual way, as if it were a mere association evoked by something he has just said. The linguistic means most commonly found is a relative pronoun (see below). After the myth has been told, he often maintains the impression of its being a spontaneous association by characterizing it in retrospect as an irrelevant digression. This presentation is fictional (see below). Of course, the myths are meant to be relevant to the odes as wholes.

In the rare cases in which the poet does explicitly say something about the relevance of the myth, he is often deliberately misleading. Thus in *P.*8, e.g., lines 38-40 make explicit that the poet's intention in introducing Amphiaraus' speech with its narrative setting is to draw a complimentary analogy between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence. Amphiaraus' words about the λῆμα of the fathers being visible in the sons, prompted by his seeing the Epigonoi displaying the same martial excellence as the Seven and especially by his recognizing his own prowess and mantic ability in his son Alcmaeon,[43] are explicitly presented as applying to the victor's continuation of the athletic successes of his family.[44] The 'coda' (56-60) again draws the parallel between Alcmaeon and Aristomenes. The poet makes explicit that, like Amphiaraus, he too praises Alcmaeon (καὶ αὐτός, 56). Alcmaeon receives crowns and song (57), just like the victor (19/20). By referring to Alcmaeon's mantic abilities and by explicitly connecting them with 'inherited skills' (60), the 'coda' emphasises again that the power of heredity is the *tertium comparationis* between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon. These explicit statements about the relevance of the myth are misleading in sofar as lines 48-55, Amphiaraus' prophecy about the outcome of the battle, are irrelevant to the explicitly avowed aim of the mythical example. This part of Amphiaraus' speech does not bear on the analogy between the victor and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence.[45] Thus the purpose Pindar is explicit about is not his only purpose for telling the myth.

---

[43] It is Alcmaeon's martial quality that receives the chief emphasis in the immediate context. His mantic abilities are hinted at by the mention of his snake emblem on his shield (46, see my note *ad loc.*); they will be explicitly referred to in line 60 below. See also Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 32 n. 22. For Amphiaraus' double excellence cf. also *O.*6.17.

[44] Thus also Thummer, *Isthmische*, p. 45; Hess, *RhM* 88, 1939, 287/8; Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 198; and especially Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 31/2.

[45] See, e.g., Boeckh *ad loc.* (p. 311); Drachmann, *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*, p. 325; Christ *ad loc.* (p. 198); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 182.

Myths are the clearest but not the only examples. A similar tendency towards implicitness exists with respect to gnomic passages. Thus in *N.*3, e.g., after having dealt with Peleus and Telamon, the poet gives a gnomic passage about the all-importance of inborn qualities (40-2). This passage is marked by δέ as a next independent step in the sequence. There is no explicit signal for the relevance of the passage. After the gnomic interruption, the poet proceeds to relate his story about the second generation of the Aeacids, Achilles. The only signal, again is δέ (43). This procedure ignores the gnomic interruption. Achilles stands as a *topic* on the same level as Peleus and Telamon in the passages preceding the *gnomae.* The relation between the *gnomae* and what precedes, as well as between the *gnomae* and the subsequent passage is left to the interpretation of the audience, as is its relevance for the ode as a whole.

By being implicit about the relevance of myths, gnomic passages, or other sections, the poet appeals to the listener's capacity to grasp the coherence of seemingly independent passages which are juxtaposed without any signal guiding him in his interpretation of how they cohere. To this extent the phenomenon is comparable to other familiar poetic procedures such as the use of metaphors, in that it makes similar special demands upon the concentration and intellect of the hearer. Implicitness grants the hearer the pleasure of finding out himself how things cohere, and thus it is a means of effecting that the audience gets involved in the performance. Quintilian provides an acute analysis:

> Ingeniosa haec et fortia et ex ancipiti diserta creduntur, pervasitque iam multos ista persuasio, ut id [iam] demum eleganter atque exquisite dictum putent, quod interpretandum sit. Sed auditoribus etiam nonnullis grata sunt haec, quae cum intellexerunt, acumine suo delectantur et gaudent, non quasi audierint, sed quasi invenerint (Quintil.*Inst.Or.*8.2.21).[46]

Moreover, as is also the case with metaphors,[47] implicitness may result in polyinterpretability, which may be one of the effects intended

[46] Cf. also ἐν τούτοις δὲ οὖν τὸ πιθανόν, καὶ ἐν ὧι Θεόφραστός φησιν, ὅτι οὐ πάντα ἐπ' ἀκριβείας δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν ἀλλ' ἔνια καταλιπεῖν καὶ τῶι ἀκροατῆι συνιέναι καὶ λογίζεσθαι ἐξ αὑτοῦ· συνεὶς γὰρ τὸ ἐλλειφθὲν ὑπὸ σοῦ οὐκ ἀκροατὴς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς σου γίνεται καὶ ἅμα εὐμενέστερος· συνετὸς γὰρ ἑαυτῶι δοκεῖ διὰ σὲ τὸν ἀφορμὴν παρεσχηκότα αὐτῶι τοῦ συνιέναι, τὸ δὲ πάντα ὡς ἀνοήτωι λέγειν καταγινώσκοντι ἔοικεν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ, Theophr.*fr.*696 FHS&G (= Demetr.*Eloc.*222). Arist.*Rhet.* 1400b26ff. says that, when the conclusion of a syllogism is one which the audience can reach for themselves, the persuasiveness of the logic is enhanced.

[47] See, e.g., my 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89, 1994, 305-317.

by the poet. By not telling his audience what the relevance of the myth is, Pindar leaves the door open for multiple relevance. In fact, most of his myths are relevant at several levels; more often than not they are inter-related with different nexus of inter-relations in the rest of the ode. Finally, it ties in with his general tendency to present his odes as if they were spontaneous, informal celebration, created at the very spot, rather than the intricate, well rehearsed performances that they were (see below).

Implicitness in Intersentential Relations

It hardly needs be observed that more is left to the interpretation of the audience in poetry than in prose, and that especially 'logical relations'[48] on an intersentential level are preferably left implicit in poetry. A poet generally does not use phrases like 'in the first place, on the other hand, therefore, nevertheless.'[49] He makes statements and he leaves it to his audience to interpret how these statements cohere. As in:

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
  Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
  And summer's lease hath all too short a date:
Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
  And often is his gold complexion dimmed;
And every fair from fair sometime declines,
  By chance, or nature's changing course untrimmed;
But thy eternal summer shall not fade,
  Nor lose possession of that fair thou owest,
Nor shall Death brag thou wanderest in his shade,
  When in eternal lines to time thou growest;
    So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
    So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

William Shakespeare, *Sonnet* xviii.

---

[48] 'Logical' here does not imply the range of connotations which the term 'logic' evokes in philosophical contexts or aboard the USS Enterprise. I use the notion 'logical relation' (of a part of the text with its context) here simply as short hand for the status and relevance of that part of the text in the light of its surrounding textual environment, which can be described in terms of, e.g., antithesis, explanation, causality, etc.

[49] Of course, some poets do, ironically disregarding the conventions of lyric style for some special purpose. Steiger, *Grundbegriffe*, p. 37, gives Spitteler's *Bescheidenes Wünschlein* as an example ("Damals, ganz zuerst am Anfang, / wenn ich hätte sagen sollen, / Was, im Fall ich wünschen dürfte, / ich mir würde wünschen wollen ...").

On the level of intersentential relations this is a rather complex poem. In prose the train of thought could be phrased as follows: "Shall I compare you to a summer's day? No, I won't do that, since the comparison is inadequate in two ways. In the first place you are more lovely and more temperate than a summer's day. An example of summer not always being temperate is that rough winds do shake the darling buds of May, etc. A second objection to the comparison is that summer is transitory, whereas you will live for ever. The reason for this is that you are immortalized in this poem." Shakespeare provides only a minimum of signals guiding the reader in the interpretation of this 'logically' rather complex train of thought. We have 'and' in lines 4, 6 and 7; 'but' in 9, and 'nor' in 10 and 11. And of these only 'but' in line 9 is an explicit 'logical' signal in the real sense of the word, defining the status and relevance of the sentence it introduces in the light of what precedes.[50]

Pindar, probably more so than any other poet, exploits the observed penchant of lyric style for implicit intersentential relations. The most common means a speaker of Greek has at his disposal for the juxtaposition of independent statements while being implicit about how their contents cohere, are the particle δέ[51] and the asyndeton. Very frequently indeed does Pindar thus juxtapose sentences of which the contents appear, on closer consideration, to be antithetical, explanatory, etc.

Pindar's implicitness in this respect is sometimes explained in diachronical terms, the idea being that authors of the archaic age lack the capacity of logically structuring their texts, because philosophy has not yet emerged in order to create the conditions for them to think logically.[52] But, as Dornseiff (*Pindars Stil*, 94/5) rightly ob-

---

[50] On the regular absence of explicit 'logical' signals in lyric style see further especially Staiger, *Grundbegriffe*, 36-44) with many fine examples from German literature. His introduction of this section ("Die Einheitlichkeit der Stimmung ist im Lyrischen um so nötiger, als der Zusammenhang, den wir sonst von einer sprachlichen Äußerung erwarten, hier manchmal nicht ausgeprägt ist. Die Sprache scheint im Lyrischen auf vieles wieder zu verzichten, was sie in allmählicher Entwicklung von parataktischer zu hypotaktischer Fügung, von Adverbien zu Konjunktionen, von temporalen Konjunktionen zu kausalen in Richtung auf logische Deutlichkeit gewonnen hat.", pp. 36/7) precisely signals the point at issue, though I do not sympathize with his diachronical approach of the subject.

[51] The two most recent extensive discussions of the particle δέ in ancient Greek, Sicking, *Particle Usage*, 10-7, and esp. 45/6, and Bakker, *Studies in Language* 17, 1993, 275-311, conclusively demonstrate that δέ does not convey information about relations between sentence *content*,—as opposed to Denniston's categorizations, such as continuative, adversative, δέ for γάρ, δέ for οὖν, δέ for ἤ, etc. A traffic sign also is useful only if it always means the same.

[52] See, e.g., Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare*, p. 409.

jects: "Der Chorlyriker meidet die logischen Partikeln bewußt und ist nicht etwa unfähig zu ihrem richtigen Gebrauch: wo er sie gebraucht, tut er es mit Bündigkeit. Man darf einem einzelnen Chorlyriker wie etwa Pindar nicht die Fähigkeit absprechen, Sätze logisch zu verknüpfen."[53] Implicitness of intersentential relations is to be regarded as a generic feature; its association with the archaic age may be due to the fact that hardly any prose from that period survives. The poet appeals to a capacity in the listener or reader to grasp the coherence of independent statements which are juxtaposed without any signal guiding him in his interpretation of how they cohere. In this respect there is no fundamental difference between juxtaposing separate and seemingly unrelated sections of an ode, without guiding the audience in its appreciation of the coherence, and juxtaposing independent sentences in the same fashion. The goals are the same: poetic economy and hightening of the audience's attentiveness, substituting active involvement for passive consumption.

Implicitness with respect to the status and relevance of a sentence in the light of its surrounding context may result in polyinterpretability, which may be one of the effects intended by the poet, as in the following passage from Ajax' famous penultimate speech:

> κἀγὼ γάρ, ὅc τὰ δείν' ἐκαρτέρουν τότε,
> βαφῆι cίδηροc ὥc, ἐθηλύνθην cτόμα
> πρὸc τῆcδε τῆc γυναικόc· οἰκτίρω δέ νιν
> χήραν παρ' ἐχθροῖc παῖδά τ' ὀρφανὸν λιπεῖν.
>
> S.*Aj*.650-53.

> For even I, erst wondrous firm,—yea, as iron hardened in the dipping,—felt the keen edge of my temper softened by yon woman's words; and I feel the pity of leaving her a widow with my foes, and the boy an orphan.[54]

---

[53] Dornseiff's explanation is that: "Die Chorlyrik knüpft das Gebinde des Satzes auseinander und gibt dem dadurch losgelösten, vereinzelten Wort größeres Gewicht, daher die sonoren und pittoresken Worte, die zugleich Ohr und Phantasie füllen. Die Musik trug diese isolierten Worte und gab ihnen das nötige Relief, so daß die Partikeln entbehrlich waren." (*ibidem*, cf. also his remark that "es geht nicht an, auf einen Taktteil zu singen ἀναξιφόρμιγγεc, dann auf einen musikalisch ebenso wichtigen οἱ δ' ὅτε δή, τὸν δ' ὡc οὖν, ἦ ῥά νύ τοι", p. 93). This explanation in musical terms is not very satisfactory. It is hard to believe that music has the capacity of fulfilling the function of explicit means of signalling the status and relevance of one utterance in the light of another, so as to make such explicit markers obsolete by replacing them. Unfortunately, one cannot make an unintelligible sequence of separate thoughts understandable just by singing it.

[54] Translation by R.C. Jebb.

Ajax' entire speech is intended by Sophocles to be polyinterpretable. This unequalled Sophoclean *tour de force* aims at portraying Ajax' isolation by staging him as holding on firmly to his resolution to kill himself while the other characters in the play understand him to be saying that he has changed his mind, a tragic misunderstanding that the audience of the play is supposed to see through. In the lines quoted Ajax means to say: 'So far I've been a tough guy. And now the dame's drivel softened my temper like iron is softened in the dipping. Yet, the thought of leaving her a widow with my enemies makes me feel sorry.' The other characters in the play understand him to be saying: 'I, who was tough before like iron hardened in the dipping, now softened my temper by the words of this woman; and pity prevents me from leaving her a widow among my enemies.' With Ajax' intended meaning there is an adversative relation between the contents of both main clauses coordinated by δέ in 652; with the interpretation intended by Sophocles to be the meaning inferred from Ajax' words by the others, the relation between the contents of both main clauses is progressive.[55]

For intersentential implicitness effecting polyinterpretability, the following Pindaric passage can be compared:

> (Hippolyta has told her husband that Peleus had tried to seduce her, but it was the other way around:)
>
> πολλὰ γὰρ νιν παντὶ θυμῶι
> παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν. τοῖο δ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι·
> εὐθὺϲ δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν, ξεινίου πατρὸϲ χόλον
> δείϲαιϲ· ὁ δ' εὖ φράϲθη... *N.*5.31-4
>
> For she tried hard to persuade him and begged him with all her heart. Her steep words stimulated his feelings. Immediately he repulsed the bride, out of fear of the anger of his Father, the god of Guests. He took good notice of it [and he approved from heaven, the cloud-maker Zeus, King of Immortals, that soon he would win one of the Nereids with golden spindle as his sea-bride].

τοῖο δ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι is quite ambiguous as it stands. The Greek is no more explicit than 'her steep words stimulated his feeling.' In the context about Hippolyta's attempts to seduce Peleus it could mean two things: either 'her steep words roused his anger'

[55] Passages like this demonstrate that Denniston's categorization is not quite felicitous. Labeling δέ as either 'adversative' or 'progressive' (or the like) *a priori* deprives one from the possibility of understanding what is really going on: ambiguity exists by virtue of δέ *not* conveying information about relations between sentence contents.

or 'her steep words stimulated his lust' (see my note). Whatever the primary effect of her words was, he immediately rejected her, out of fear of Zeus' wrath. δέ in line 33 leaves implicit whether Peleus' rejection of Hippolyta was a consequence of his primary reaction or in antithesis with it, thus maintaining the ambiguity.

Implicitness within the Sentence

Pindar's general tendency towards implicitness can be observed on the smallest scale too. Not only does the poet leave implicit the status and relevance of separate sections and subsequent sentences in the light of one another, also various inter-relations are left to the interpretation of the hearer within the scope of the single sentence.

To begin with an exceptional case—it has been observed before[56] that Pindar often uses verbs meaning 'touching,' like (ἐπι)ψαύω, (ἐφ)ἅπτομαι, and θιγγάνω, or 'mingling,' like (cυμ)μείγνυμι and κεράννυμι, and also ὁμιλέω, freely, in a metaphorical sense, in order to relate two notions to one another. This usage is especially dominant in the inter-relation of entities from the visible world with abstract notions (e.g., ὥραι τε κεκραμένον, ἅ ποτε | ἀναιδέα Γανυμήδει θάνατον ἆλκε cὺν Κυπρογενεῖ, *O.*10.104/5; εὔχεται [*sc.* Damophilos] ... ἡcυχίαι θιγέμεν, *P.*4.296; οὐδ' ἀκράντοιc ἐφάψατο ἔπεcι, *O.*1.86; ποίαιc ὁμιλεῖ τύχαιc, *N.*1.61; ἀθανάτοιc Αἰνηcιδάμου | παῖδεc ἐν τιμαῖc ἔμειχθεν, *I.*2.28/8; ἄξιοc εὐλογίαιc ἀcτῶν μεμεῖχθαι, *I.*3.3; ὄφρα τιc τᾶν ἐν δυνατῶι φιλοτάτων ἐπιψαύειν ἔραται, *P.*4.92; γλυκείαc πρῶτον ἔψαυc' Ἀφροδίταc, *O.*6.35; πλαγίαιc δὲ φρένεccιν οὐχ ὁμῶc πάντα χρόνον θάλλων ὁμιλεῖ [*sc.* ὄλβοc], *I.*3.5/6; etc.). But it is by no means confined to that (cf., e.g., χαλεπὰ δ' ἔριc ἀνθρώποιc ὁμιλεῖν κρεccόνων, *N.*10.72; ὀκτὼ cτεφάνοιc ἐμεῖχθεν ἤδη, *N.*2.22, etc.). Outside Pindar the usage is rare.[57]

Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 226, perceived of this phenomenon as a symptom of the primitivity of the Greek language in Pindar's times: "No

---

[56] See, e.g., Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, 94-6; Bowra, *Pindar*, 226/7; Gerber on *O.*1.86.

[57] For verbs of touching only S.*Ph.*408 is mentioned by Bowra (*Pindar*, 227 n.1); for verbs of mingling: *Od.*20.203, Hdt.7.203, S.*Aj.*895, *Ant.*1311, *El.*1485, and Ar.*Pl.*853 (*ibid.* n.2, 3); cf. also S.*Aj.*1201, E.*Or.*345. Furthermore, it is remarkable that Pindar indiscriminately uses both the genitive and the dative after such verbs. It has been tried to detect a difference in meaning beween both constructions (O. Erdmann, *De Pindari usu syntactico*, Halis 1867, 31/2; E. Friese, *De casuum singulari apud Pindarum usu*, Diss. Berlin 1866, 62-4), but cf. cέ, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψευδεῖ θιγεῖν, *P.*9.42, with ψευδέων δ' οὐχ ἅπτεται, *P.*3.29, and ἀνορέαιc δ' ἐcχάταιcιν | οἴκοθεν cτάλαιcιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαιc, *I.*4.11/2, with νῦν δὲ πρὸc ἐcχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖcιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέοc cταλᾶν, *O.*3.43.

doubt he was to some degree impelled to do this by the nature of the Greek language which had not yet matured a full vocabulary to express the relation between the visible world and what lay behind or beyond it." Again, I do not believe such diachronical explanations to be very fruitful. When Pindar says, e.g., ἁ δικαιόπολις ἀρεταῖς | κλειναῖσιν Αἰακιδᾶν | θιγοῖσα νᾶσος, *P.*8.22-4, by using θιγοῖσα, he compellingly visualizes a connection between Aegina and the ἀρεταί of the Aeacids—a connection that is self-evident only to the point that the Aeacids come from Aegina—, while relieving himself from the obligation to define exactly how, in physical terms, we are supposed to envisage that connection. The expression is direct, suggestive, and economical, at the cost of analytical precision. The free, metaphorical usage of such verbs is a valuable tool which enables the poet to visualize a great variety of relations between notions in an arrestingly direct fashion. It ties in with his general tendency towards implicitness to the extent that the precise nature of the relation is left to the interpretation of the audience.

Dornseiff groups examples of the free, metaphorical usage of verbs of 'touching' and 'mingling' under the heading 'colourless verbs.'[58] Surely 'colourless' is not exactly to the point as a characterization of such verbs (their denotation is quite specific, their nonmetaphorical reference is confined to a relatively small and well-defined set of actions in reality); but there is a category of verbs, not discussed in detail by Dornseiff, the usage of which is comparable to the verbs of 'mingling' and 'touching,' and for which 'colourless' may be more suitable as a characterization. Pindar's usage of the verb φέρω is a case in point: cf., e.g., αἰδὼς ... | ἃ φέρει δόξαν, *N.*9.33/4; ὁ πονήσαις δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει, *I.*1.40; αὔξων δὲ πάτραν Μειδυλιδᾶν λόγον φέρεις, | τὸν ὅνπερ ποτ' Ὀικλέος παῖς ... | ... αἰνίξατο, *P.*8.38-40, where 'you carry Amphiaraus' word' refers to 'you qualify for Amphiaraus' word being applied to you.' φέρω can be called 'colourless' to the extent that its denotation is relatively unspecific: also in common Greek, the verb may be used to refer to a relatively large variety of actions in reality. The three examples cited have in common that Pindar exploits the unspecificity of the verb, extending its usage slightly, in order to establish connections between notions, while not exerting himself to spell out the precise nature of the connection. Comparable to φέρειν in this respect is Pindar's usage of ἕπομαι (cf., e.g., Ζεῦ, μεγάλαι δ' ἀρεταὶ θνατοῖς ἕπον-

[58] "Den alles beherrschenden Hauptwörtern stehen seltsam farblose Zeitwörter gegenüber" (*Pindars Stil*, p. 94).

ται | ἐκ ϲέθεν, *I*.3.4/5; ϲῶμα μὲν πάντων ἕπεται θανάτωι περιϲθενεῖ, *fr*.131b.1; ἕπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάϲτωι | μέτρον, *O*.13.47/8), ἔχω (cf., e.g., ὁ γὰρ καιρὸϲ πρὸϲ ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει, *P*.4.286; ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ | ϲκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, *N*.7.12/3), ἄγω (cf., e.g., ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴϲχιον φυᾶϲ, *I*.7.22), and perhaps also φιλέω (cf., e.g., ἡϲυχία δὲ φιλεῖ μὲν ϲυμπόϲιον, *N*.9.48; ἀεθλονικία δὲ μάλιϲτ' ἀοιδὰν φιλεῖ, *N*.3.7). This category of verbs differs from the 'touching' and 'mingling' category in that its usage does not depend on breaking through the relatively strict and well-defined semantic bonds by means of the procedure commonly known as metaphor, but rather on slightly stretching a much less strictly defined and more flexible semantic bond; the two categories have in common that they are used by Pindar as a means of inter-relating notions in an economical and suggestive way, while leaving the precise nature of the connection—which can often be quite complex and quite difficult to spell out precisely—to the interpretation of his audience.

In inter-relating notions referred to by nouns, the use of the genitive is one of the most common means for a Greek author to signal that one notion is to be seen as connected with and subordinate to another. The genitive as such does not convey any information about the precise nature of this inter-relation. The habit of traditional grammar of classifying genitives in semantic types ('possessive, partitive, qualitative, explanatory, subjective vs. objective,' etc.)[59] wrongly suggests the availabilty of any formal criteria for distinguishing one from the other; these labels mirror strategies of translating genitives into a non-flective language, and do not have any bearing upon the structure of Ancient Greek as such. To this extent, the procedure of linking one noun phrase to another by means of a genitive is a semantically neutral and therefore implicit strategy (as opposed, e.g., to the use of prepositional phrases, in which case the denotation of the specific preposition is a guidance in defining the semantic nature of the connection effected). The common observation that most of these semantic types, especially the so-called 'objective' genitive, are by far more frequent in poetry than in prose,[60] is to be explained in this light. It is a manifestation of the poets' penchant for implicitness. Whereas most prose authors tend to reserve the use of the genitive for those cases in which the semantic relation between the genitive noun phrase and the governing expression is self-evident or evident from the context, and not seldom choose to

---

[59] See, e.g., Kühner-Gerth, II 1, pp. 332-41 (§ 414).
[60] See, e.g., Kühner-Gerth, II 1, p. 335 (§ 414.4).

use prepositions in order to remove any ambiguity that might ensue from the use of a bare genitve and indeed make the precise nature of the relation between both notions as explicit as possible (e.g., τὴν ἀπ' ἐκείνων χάριν, X.*Comm*.2.7.9; ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν δορυφόρων φόβος; X.*Hier*.10.3; τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν δέος, Lys.12.66, etc.), many poets are led by the opposite tendency and use the genitive for a much wider range of semantic relations, including those that are not entirely evident. One of the boldest examples in Pindar is: δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ γλώσσαι λιγυρᾶς ἀκόνας, *O*.6.82. By using the genitive, Pindar signals that the notion 'clear sounding whetstone' is to be seen as connected with and subordinate to the notion 'tongue.'[61] The expression is no more explicit than that. Whether we are to believe that the tongue is as sharp as an object newly committed to the whetstone, or whether it is as clear sounding as a whetstone, or some combination of both—in this sentence there is no signal whatsoever guiding us in our interpretation of the nature of the relation between the two noun phrases.

It will be clear that my discussion of implicitness in Pindar does not aim at being exhaustive, neither with respect to examples given nor as a list of related features and procedures. Nor is it my illusion that my insights in the individual characteristics of Pindar's style brought together here are exactly new. The point of the exploratory survey above is to draw attention to implicitness as a general tendency in Pindar's style, permeating all levels of his discourse and providing a common explanation for a great variety of his stylistic peculiarities, which have all been observed before. In this tendency most poetry differs from most prose. The difference between Pindar and most other archaic and classical Greek poets is one of degree, not of kind. But Pindar's tendency to be implicit is bolder than with most other poets, especially with respect to the macro stucture of his texts—which becomes all the more striking in the light of his concern for ποικιλία, a centrifugal tendency that only hightens the need for explicit signals guiding the audience in their perception of coherence in diversity—, to such an extent, that the difference almost becomes one of kind. More than any other Greek poet does Pindar exploit implicitness as a faculty of lyric style, with a wide range of advantages. Implicitness is a means of effecting poetic economy, relying on brevity and suggestive directness rather than analytical precision. It makes demands upon

---

[61] Word order strongly pleads against taking the genitive noun phrase to be ruled by δόξαν.

the concentration and intellect of the audience; it increases its attentiveness and aims at a more active participation on its part in the poetic communication. Moreover, implicitness may result in polyinterpretability, which may be one of the effects intended by the poet.

It is perhaps useful to say here explicitly that I do not believe that the interpretator's task must end in *epoche* or *aporia* whenever he discerns implicitness. Along the lines of the general principle described by Grice, that effective communication depends upon the assumption on the part of the hearer that what the speaker says makes sense, the critic, like Pindar's audience, ought to cling on to his belief that Pindar's text is coherent, also in those cases in which the nature of the coherence is not being explicitly expressed, and try to describe this coherence, albeit with an acute awareness of the degree of guidance Pindar provides in the form of explicit signals.

The Fictional Mimesis of Ex Tempore *Speech*

Bowra begins his *Pindar* with the following assertion: "No Greek poet says so much as Pindar about his art." (p. 1). True, we find passages liberally scattered through his odes in which the poet reflects on his own poetical manoeuvres. The poet 'dramatizes' his own role.[62] He stages himself as composing his odes on the spot. The most eye-catching examples are the so-called break-off passages. Pindar is notorious for suddenly intruding into a poem in order to break off a narrative. He can stage himself in two ways, either by a first person verb, with or without an emphatic pronoun, or by an imperative of self-exhortation (or kindred expressions like, e.g., χρή).[63] This procedure of intruding into a poem and breaking off a narrative that is in full swing has in the past given rise to much misunderstanding. Some have taken Pindar's presentation to be genuine and concluded that he did in fact lose control over his ode.[64] A

[62] On the 'dramatic' dimension of the performance of Pindaric odes see also Herington, *Poetry into Drama*, pp. 26-31. Some of the most vivid and arresting examples of 'lyric dramatizations of lyric performances' are presented by Alcman. In *fr.* 1 *PMG*, at line 39, the chorus begins to sing to itself and about itself; in lines 64-8 we seem actually to get a glimpse of their looks. The same happens in *fr.* 3 *PMG* at lines 61-72. Alcman dramatizes his own role as a composer in *fr.* 39 and 40 *PMG*. See Herington, pp. 20-6.

[63] Examples of break off or formalised transitions with a 'dramatizing' element include: *O.*1.52, 2.95, 9.35, 13.93, *P.*1.81, 4.247, 8.29, 9.76, 10.51, 11.38, *N.*3.26, 4.33, 69, 5.14, 7.53, 70, 10.19, etc.

[64] Thus, e.g., Farnell on *N.*5.14-8 (I, pp. 187/8), quoted in *N.*5 Interpretation, p. 64, n. 9.

second misunderstanding resulted from the assumption that such break offs were *conventional* epinician stock procedures, as it has been argued by Schadewaldt, Bundy, and their followers. These break off procedures are 'conventional' only to the extent that they occur several times in Pindar's odes, of course not to the extent that the audience was expecting them (as they would be waiting, e.g., for victory data to be mentioned), which would rather spoil their effect.

Only recently have critics begun to fully appreciate the fictional nature of such break off procedures. Carey (*Five Odes*, p. 5) says: "although Pindar works with conscious artistry, he deliberately creates and sustains the impression of informal, extempore composition." As Andrew Miller has demonstrated in his important article 'Pindaric Mimesis: The Associative Mode', *CJ* 89, 1993, 21-53, we must distinguish the 'I' staged in the poems, the garrulous babbler Pindar pretends to be for the sake of creating the illusion that he is composing his text on the spot, from the poet who actually crafted highly intricate odes with great care and skill. The poetic 'I' is a fictional mimesis of an *ex tempore* speaker, who creates the illusion that the story he is telling turns out to be unbecoming and that he did not realize this when he started to tell it, and who pretends he is reacting to his own statements, as if he were hearing them for the first time himself. Because of the fictional nature of the passages in which Pindar dramatizes his own role as a poet, the idea formulated as it is in the opening sentence of Bowra's monograph is to be approached with caution.

Carey rightly emphasised the rhetorical convenience of this fictive mimesis: "This 'oral subterfuge', by easing openings, transitions and finales, allows the poet to treat themes at a greater or lesser length according to his aims, to touch on tales or events without the need to develop them beyond his requirements" (*ibid.*). The fictional mimesis of *ex tempore* speech provides the poet with a valuable tool for effecting diversity, for easily combining disparate material, and for playing with the audience's expectations and stimulating its attentiveness by proceeding in a slightly or entirely different way than it expects. Moreover, the fiction of extemporizing composition gives Pindar the opportunity to provide fictional motivations of his break offs, fresh starts, and changes of direction, often in gnomic statements. In other words, the 'oral subterfuge' makes it possible for the poet to incorporate his gnomes in the drift of his fictional argument.

The fictional mimesis of ex tempore speech gives Pindar's odes an air of spontaneity. In reality his odes are highly intricate, skillfully composed artefacts. They were everything but spontaneous reactions to a victory; they were commissioned and paid for. Their per-

formances, including instrumentalized multiple voice and synchronized dance, would have required extensive rehearsal, especially in the case of the longer odes. Yet Pindar attempts to hide the mercantile nature of his art[65] and the lengthy process of composition and rehearsal and is at pains to create the illusion that his odes take shape at the very spot, fictionally representing the process of composition rather than offering the ready products of that process. This fiction of spontaneity as such contributes to the encomiastic aims of the victory odes, to the extent that it camouflages the formality of the occasion and the coldness of the contractual relationship, and presents the praise the victor is getting as a voluntary[66] outpouring of pure joy that is incited by nothing but his accomplishment.

There is also an element of humour in this fiction, or at least irony, to the extent that there is a discrepancy between the poet's fictional intentions and the really intended effect of his words. One of the most illustrative examples is the following:

πίτναν τ' ἐς αἰθέρα χεῖρας ἁμᾶ
Ἐνδαΐδος ἀριγνῶτες υἱοὶ καὶ βία Φώκου κρέοντος
ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὃν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου.
αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκαι τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον,
πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον, καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους
δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνώνας ἔλασεν. στάσομαι·

*N.*5.11-6.

[Of old they prayed that Aegina would be noble in men and renowned in ships, when they stood by the altar of Zeus Hellenios] and together spread out their hands to the sky, the famous sons of Endaïs and Phocus, the mighty prince, child of a goddess, whom Psamatheia bore where the sea-waves are breaking. Shame prevents me from saying something big, and not hazarded according to Right, how they left the famous island, and what deity drove the valiant men from Oenona. I shall halt.

The break off here is striking in two respects. First, the 'painful' episode, Peleus' and Telamon's murder of their half-brother Phocus, is not related at all. It is only the name Phocus that suggests the association (to the poet, on the level of the fiction), and the audience is guided to think of the fratricide precisely by the fact that the poet breaks off his narrative. It is the poet's fictional horror after having mentioned Phocus that tells the story. Second, after saying that he

---

[65] In two passages, *P.*11.41-4 and *I.*2.1-11, Pindar thematizes the financial side of his commissions for specific purposes. See Woodbury, *TAPhA* 99, 1968, 527-42.

[66] For the poet's willingness to praise the victor, see my note on *P.*8.67 (p. 555).

will not tell this story, Pindar continues to allude to the consequence of this murder in the two subordinate question clauses in 15/6.[67] Thus the poet breaks off a story, although he has said nothing 'unbecoming' yet; it is the very break off that suggests the unbecoming episode he wants to skip, and after saying that he wants to skip this episode he continues to allude to it. The poet's fictional intentions and the intended effect of what he is saying could not have clashed more. This is irony, and we ought not to underestimate Pindar's audience by assuming they would not have recognized it as such. The poet plays an intellectual game, and games like this contribute to his audience's intellectual appreciation of his art.

Miller showed that the 'oral subterfuge', the fictional imitation of spontaneous speech, is not limited to break off passages. The frequent casual, associative introductions of myths by means of a relative pronoun are part of the same fiction. The poet pretends that the story he wants to tell leaps to his mind as an association occasioned by some detail he has just mentioned.

Relative Clauses and 'Relative Connection'

It has been observed before[68] that Pindar often uses relative pronouns as a structuring device. There are according to Des Places (*Pronom*, pp. 48-50) fourty-four examples of a relative pronoun introducing a myth.[69] Since the relative pronouns in these cases are the 'hinges' between passages quite diverse as far as the contents are concerned, the editors tend to punctuate heavily before the pronoun. Thus we are dealing with the phenomenon of the 'relative connection' ('relativischer Anschluß', 'relatif de liaison'), which can be defined provisionally as a relative introducing a main clause instead of a subordinate clause. Because of the punctuation in our texts, the relative gives the impression of actually *signalling* a transition to a myth. The question is whether it would have had the same

---

[67] The particle δή gives an ironical twist to the subordinate question, in that it suggests that Pindar realizes that it is a logical question to ask, how it could happen that Peleus and Telamon left Aegina. But he is not going to answer it nonetheless. See my note *ad loc.* (p. 120).

[68] See e.g. Gildersleeve *ad O.*1.25; Young, *Three Odes*, *ad P.*11.17, p.32 n.4; J. Horváth, 'The Language of Pindar', *AUB* 4, 1976, 3-11; Gerber *ad O.*1.25 (pp. 53/4). Bundy (I 8, n. 27) might be right in observing that "the use of the relative pronoun in major transitions is descended from the use of the relative in cult hymns to introduce descriptions of the god's powers, and in rhapsodic hymns to introduce the central narrative illustrating the god's greatness."; see also Köhnken, p. 132; Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, 18, 22, 91 n. 16, 109, 113, 142.

[69] Des Places' list is not complete. See Köhnken, *Funktion des Mythos*, pp. 132/3.

effect on Pindar's audience, as Bundy (*Studia Pindarica* I, p. 8; on *O.*1.28-51) has it: "From the convention in which the legendary or mythical foil of a given ode is often introduced by a relative pronoun (τοῦ, line 25) the audience know that the laudator is committed to praise Pelops." In other words, are there any formal (syntactical) criteria that enable the audience to distinguish relatives introducing a myth from other relative clauses, so as to enable it to anticipate a transition to a myth?

The relative connection is not given much attention in the authoritative grammars (see Kühner-Gerth, II pp. 434/5,[70] Schwyzer, p. 644). In modern monographs on relative clauses the relative connection is curiously enough considered to be a phenomenon typical for Latin and virtually alien to Greek.

See, e.g., C. Touratier, *La relative. Essai de théorie syntaxique (à partir de faits latins, français, allemands, anglais, grecs, hébreux, etc.)*, Paris 1980, 408: "relatif de liaison, une particularité assez originale du relatif latin"; H. Kurzová, *Der Relativsatz in den indoeuropäischen Sprachen*, Hamburg 1981, 46/7: "Typisch für den *qui*-Satz in der lateinischen Prosa. ... ein Mittel zur Realisierung der Textkohärenz. Die Grundlage für die Ausbildung dieses Mittels war aber gerade die Fähigkeit des *qui*-Satzes, neue und aktuelle Mitteilungen anzuführen. ... Dieser Gebrauch ist dem Griechischen nicht eigen. ... Es handelt sich um kein bloßes Mittel der Satzverbindung, sondern um die Erinnerung der Tatsache, die als dem Gesprächspartner bekannt vorausgesetzt wird oder von ihm anerkannt werden soll. Ὅς entspricht nicht dem bloßen *er*, sondern etwa *doch er; ja er*. Vgl. z.B. X.*Cyr.*1.6.8. Das Merkmal der Bekanntheit determiniert stets die Verwendung des Pronomens ὅς. ... Das ὅς-Pronomen pflegt die Bestimmungen einzuführen, die in den Bereich der bekannten Voraussetzungen gehören, nicht die aktuellen Tatsachen und die Weiterentwicklung der Handlung ausdrücken." However, also in Greek examples can be found of a relative clause containing new information, cf., e.g., εἰς καλὸν ἡμῖν Ἄνυτος ὅδε παρεκαθέζετο· ᾧ μεταδῶμεν τῆς ζητήσεως, Pl.*Men.*89e; cf. also Lys.12.13. See Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 18-20.

Touratier, *La relative*, pp. 408-52, deals with the problem of definition and, concentrating on Latin, tries to detect formal criteria to decide whether or not the relative introduces a main clause. His re-

---

[70] "Das Relativpronomen dient nicht allein zur Verbindung eines Nebensatzes mit einem Hauptsatze, sondern auch zur Anknüpfung solcher Sätze, welche eigentlich als beigeordnete Hauptsätze hätten ausgedruckt werden sollen. Das Relativum vertritt dann die Stelle eines Demonstrativ– oder Personalpronomens in Verbindung mit einem Bindeworte, wie καί, ἀλλά od. δέ, γάρ, οὖν, ἄρα...' (II p. 434). "A description such as this shows how the phenomenon of relative connection eludes the categories of traditional grammar, a situation which leaves the motives of Greek speakers for adopting constructions of this type in the dark", Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 19.

sults are negative. As for Greek, there are cases in which such formal criteria can be detected, e.g., because a particle indicates the beginning of a new sentence,[71] or because the relative pronoun does not refer to the last mentioned possible antecedent.[72] Such instances, however, are not to be found in Pindar. In none of the cases in which a relative introduces a myth do we find formal criteria which make clear that we are dealing with is a relative connection rather than a relative subclause. Compare the following examples:

1 Κροῖcoc ἦν Λυδὸc μὲν γένοc, παῖc δὲ Ἀλυάττεω, τύραννοc δὲ ἐθνέων τῶν ἐντὸc Ἅλυοc ποταμοῦ, **ὃc** ῥέων μεcαμβρίηc μεταξὺ Cυρίων τε καὶ Παφλαγόνων ἐξιεῖ πρὸc βορῆν ἄνεμον ἐc τὸν Εὔξεινον καλεόμενον πόντον. οὗτοc ὁ Κροῖcoc βαρβάρων πρῶτοc ...

Hdt.1.6

2 πίτναν τ' ἐc αἰθέρα χεῖραc ἁμᾶ
Ἐνδαΐδοc ἀριγνῶτεc υἱοὶ καὶ βία Φώκου κρέοντοc,
ὁ τᾶc θεοῦ, **ὃν** Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου.
αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ...

N.5.11-4

3 εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸc ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾶι
ἀνορέαιc ὑπερτάταιc ἐπέβα παῖc Ἀριcτοφάνεο, οὐκέτι πρόcω
ἀβάταν ἅλα κιόνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέοc περᾶν εὐμαρέc,
ἥρωc θεὸc **ἃc** ἔθηκε ναυτιλίαc ἐcχάταc
μάρτυραc κλυτάc· δάμαcε δὲ θῆραc ἐν πελάγεϊ
ὑπερόχουc, ἰδίαι τ' ἐρεύναcε τεναγέων
ῥοάc, ὁπᾶι πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόcτου τέλοc,
καὶ γᾶν φράδαcε.

N.3.19-26

---

[71] Cases like: εἰcὶ δὲ καὶ δημόcιοι τούτων ἀγῶνεc καὶ ἆθλα προτίθεται· ἐν ἧι δ' ἂν τῶν φυλῶν πλεῖcτοι ὦcι δαημονέcτατοι καὶ ἀνδρικώτατοι καὶ εὐπιcτότατοι, ἐπαινοῦcιν οἱ πολῖται καὶ τιμῶcιν οὐ μόνον τὸν νῦν ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅcτιc αὐτοὺc παῖδαc ὄνταc ἐπαίδευcε, X.*Cyr*.1.2.12.

[72] An example of this is οὗτοι (*sc.* οἱ νόμοι) τοίνυν περὶ τῶν τοιούτων τοῖc ἀδικουμένοιc τοιαύτην δίκην λαμβάνειν παρακελευωονται. οἷc ὑμᾶc ἀξιῶ τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχειν, Lys.1.35/6, where the relative "does not refer back to the nearest constituent which would be grammatically capable of serving as its antecedent, nor even to the nearest but one, but to the subject and topic of the preceding clause, with all that was stated about it" (Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 19). Cf. also Lys.1.33 (ἀνθ' ὧν), where the neuter relative "refers back not to one particular grammatical antecedent but to the complex of considerations just specified in explanation of the severe punishment for fornication" (Sicking, *ibid.*). Cf. also Lys.12.43, 56, 94, 96.

Examples 1 & 2 have in common that the relative pronoun introduces a clause that provides mere background information (not moving narrative time forward), giving the location of River Halys and the identity of Phocus' mother respectively. In example 3, the relative pronoun turns out to introduce a narrative about some of Heracles' accomplishments. Yet, there are no formal (syntactical) criteria[73] setting example 3 apart from 1 & 2. What is special and 'Pindaric' about example 3 is that the sentence directly following the relative clause (23-6) is not on a par with the entire independent sentence preceding (19-23), but merely with the dependent clause that is introduced by the relative pronoun (22/3). In other words, that ὅς (22) functions as a hinge between two larger passages that are quite different with respect to their contents appears from the fact that the next, independent step in the sequence elaborates upon the relative clause exclusively.

It is crucial to realise that a listening audience, in their linear perception of the text, do not perceive the function of the relative in example 3 any differently than in 1 & 2 on the moment they hear the relative. It is only in retrospect, when they hear the following sentences elaborating upon the relative clause only, that they are in the position to realise that a transition has taken place and that the relative was the hinge. The hearer has no clue whatsoever whether a relative pronoun will merely introduce a relative clause providing background information or whether it will turn out to be the hinge between two large passages.[74] If modern editors punctuate before a relative introducing a narrative, they do so entirely on the basis of their retrospective assessment of the function of the relative on the level of content. It is, therefore, preferable in Pindar not to punctuate heavily before any relative pronoun, regardless of whether it does or does not introduce a substantial narrative section: printing a point or point above the line before the relative enables the reader to anticipate a shift in content, a faculty that Pindar's listening audience did not and were not intended to have.

---

[73] The fact that in this case—unlike comparable cases of pronouns introducing a narrative—all editors print a comma instead of a full stop or a point above the line before the relative clause goes to prove the subjectivity of punctuation in cases like this.

[74] One could argue about whether the audience were familiar with Pindar's technique of introducing myths with a relative from earlier experiences with his odes. However, the fact that not *every* relative introduces a myth, that there are also examples like 2 above—examples that moreover represent normal Greek usage—, makes it very unlikely indeed that the audience would have anticipated a transition to a myth merely on the basis of hearing a relative (as Bundy, I p. 8, has it).

Fränkel (*Wege und Formen*, pp. 40-96; cf. also Radt, *Zweiter und sechster Paian*, p. 155) explains the phenomenon by calling attention to the tendency of archaic style in general, and of Pindar in particular, to interconnect subsequent sections of a narration as closely as possible.[75] Pindar shares with his contemporaries the interest in fluency, true, but he differs from them in respect of implicitness. The casual, associative introductions of myths by means of a relative pronoun are part of the fictional imitation of spontaneous text production. The poet pretends the story he wants to tell leaps to his mind as an association occasioned by some detail he has just mentioned. The relative clause presents the association as an afterthought to a detail in the context immediately preceding. The next main clause then elaborates upon the association, which creates the illusion of the poet getting carried away by his thoughts, losing track of his main story line, and plunging into a digression. Thus the procedure of introducing a myth by means of a relative pronoun syntactically mirrors the poet's cognitive process on the level of the fiction of extemporizing speech.[76]

Linear Development:
Manipulation of Expectancy and Creation of Suspense

οὐκ ἀνδριαντόποιος εἰμ', ὥςτ' ἐλινύςοντα ἐργάζεςθαι
   ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
ἑςταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάςας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι,
   γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
ςτεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας.

*N.*5.1-3

Pindar's odes are no static artefacts. His odes were written to be performed and to appeal to the ear, which means that their audiences perceived their complexity, polymorph richness, and colourful variety in a linear fashion, as a succession of moments in time. As any art form that happens in the dimension of time, Pindar's odes are concerned with suspense. They play with the expectations of the audience. They aim at holding the attention of the audience in a firm

---

[75] Cf. also Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 19/20, on relative connections in general: "the choice of a relative pronoun rather than an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun attended by a connecting particle appears to be motivated by a desire to include what has been stated of the referent in the new clause without any rupture or discontinuity."

[76] It is worth noting that Bacchylides uses the relative only twice for introducing myths: at 9.40 and 11.40.

grip by creating tension, which results from the constant raising of expectancies and their subsequent fulfilment, partial fulfilment and partial denial, or even downright frustration.[77]

Possibly Bundy's most valuable contribution to our understanding of Pindar was that he increased our sensitivity for the dynamic nature of Pindar's odes. He demonstrated that one of the side-effects of the poet's use of material that does not immediately contribute to direct praise of the victor can be an effect of retardation. The audience expect the victory data and some sort of direct praise of the victor to be mentioned. The postponement or slow release of obligate information creates suspense. Bundy's main shortcoming was that he took retardation to be the only function of passages that are not victor praise in its narrowest sense, calling them 'foil' and investing them with contrived irrelevance.[78] Victory data are not the only type of information that can be postponed in order to create suspense. The poet may explicitly announce a theme and then postpone it, or he may only partly fulfil the expectation he has created by his explicit announcement, or not fulfil it at all.[79] The interplay between raising expectations and their subsequent postponed fulfilment, partial fulfilment, or even downright frustration is not limited to explicit announcements. The listener always makes guesses about what is to follow, based on what has gone before.[80] Pindar exerts himself more than most others to avoid making his discourse predictable. One of the most striking instruments for frustrating expectation in his repertoire is the so-called break off (see above). The poet's intrusion into a story that is in full swing, suddenly breaking it off, pretending that it is irrelevant, and steering his ode in an entire-

[77] Arist.*Rhet.*1415b2ff. discusses the use of surprise to generate attentiveness.

[78] Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 155. Cf. also Young,'Pindaric Criticism', p. 87.

[79] An example of an all but explicit announcement that is not to be fulfilled is *P.*8.28. 'The same is visible in the men of today' sounds as if followed by a colon. But what we get is a break off of the type 'too much to tell' (29-32), which does not illustrate the claim made in 28.

[80] Cf. "The complicated and multi-temporal process of remembrance and anticipation, the interplay of expectation's partial fulfillment and partial denial which constitutes every act of discursive reception and which results in no text's being either altogether incomprehensible or altogether predictable, is sacrificed if the text is reduced to a succession of atoms. ... The process of understanding is also in part hypothetico-deductive: that is, that it constantly constructs patterns of expectation on the basis of always inadequate information and constantly revises these patterns in the light of further data. As opposed to a tape-recorder, the reader or listener always makes guesses about what the next word or sentence will be: he is never entirely right, but he is rarely entirely wrong," Most, *Measures of Praise*, p. 38. Pindar's odes differ from less intricate specimina of human discourse in what appears to be a conscious exploitation of these general principles in order to generate tension and suspense.

ly different direction, is one of the most spectacular means of toying with the audience's expectancies. A slightly different procedure, which, however, aims at comparable effects, is Pindar's manipulation of mythical stories. This is different, because it depends on the audience's knowledge, so on expectancies not generated by the text itself; but Pindar's habit of introducing a mythical character and then telling his audience things about him or her that they did not know yet or that they know differently clearly aims at baffling them by doing something different than they expected, thus intensifying their attentiveness.

Most of these techniques can be illustrated from *N.*3. The ode begins with an elaborate proem, entreating the Muse to come to Aegina because a victory song is needed. The triple entreaty to the Muse, ἵκεο (3), ὄπαζε (9), and ἄρχε (10), together with the picture of the chorus waiting for her, in need of her voice (3/5), and the futures κοινώcομαι and ἕξει (12), create the illusion that the ode has not yet started. This fictional presentation is in itself constitutive of suspense: "Pindar has invested the moment of performance with dramatic tension."[81] The opening presents to us the scene of excited movement and eager expectation for the ode, which indirectly characterizes the current ode as something worth waiting for. With ἵνα (13) the Myrmidons are introduced and the expectancy is raised that this reference will be elaborated. After all they are a famous Aeginetan race who would make a fine subject for the myth in an ode for an Aeginetan victor. However, what follows is not a story about the Myrmidons. With the relative pronoun ὧν (14) the poet switches back to the present and finally gets down to his encomiastic task in its narrowest sense, mentioning the victor's name (15)[82] and

---

[81] Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, p. 112.

[82] The most spectacular examples of postponement of the victor's name are to be found in *P.*1, first mentioning Hieron in line 32, after the much admired proem, *O.*13, where Xenophon's name first occurs in the second triad, in line 28, while the first triad mentions the accomplishments of his οἶκος as a whole, and *N.*10, where it occurs is not mentioned earlier than line 24, after an entire triad about the glorious past of Argos (a procedure which may well be meant to play with the audience's expectations regarding the very genre of the ode, in that the momentary impression is given that *N.*10 is not an epinicion). In *P.*3, Hieron is first mentioned in line 80, but this is a special case since the ode is not an epinicion. Cf. further *I.*7 (line 21), *O.*10 (line 18), *O.*12 (line 18), *I.*5 (line 18), *O.*8 (line 17), *O.*14 (line 17), *P.*7 (line 17), *N.*8 (line 16), *N.*2 (line 14), *I.*1 (line 14), *I.*2 (line 14), *O.*7 (line 13), *P.*11 (line 13), *O.*6 (line 12), *O.*11 (line 12), *O.*1 (line 11), *N.*4 (line 10). *I.*8 is the only Pindaric ode that opens with the victor's name (cf. B.6). Bacchylides, as a rule, mentions the victor's name early in his odes: always in the first strophe, excepting 9 (where Automedes is first mentioned in the first epode), 5, and 11 (both having the victor's name at the beginning of the first antistrophe; we cannot be sure about 1, 8, 10, 12, and 13).

praising his accomplishment.[83] The reference to the Pillars of Heracles (21), symbolizing that the victor has reached the highest possible achievement, is part of the direct victor praise; but then this reference is elaborated upon and we get a story about Heracles setting up the Pillars (19-26), which is not something the audience could have anticipated, especially since its expects a story from the Aeginetan mythical arsenal.[84] The Heracles story is then broken off abruptly in 26, just when it was getting into full swing.[85] The break off receives a lengthy motivation (26-32) which promises a transition to 'Aeacus and his stock' (28). This transition is postponed for three and a half lines (29-32, lines with an unusual high degree of information density). From 32 onwards the poet's promise is fulfilled and the audience's expectation is satisfied—but only partially so. We get a story about Peleus, so about 'Aeacus' stock.' Aeacus himself will never be mentioned again.[86] The audience's expectations are further frustrated because the details of the Peleus story are surprising: Peleus is said to have cut his own spear, although the audience thought that Chiron gave it to him as a wedding present, and he is said to have sacked Iolcus single-handedly, although the audience knew otherwise. Then the transition that occurs in 36 to Telamon is in itself no source of amazement. He is Peleus' brother and another good old Aeginetan hero of 'Aeacus' stock.' But the lines devoted to him (36-9) continuously evoke associations with Heracles, who had just recently been rejected as a suitable subject for the present ode.

---

[83] A slightly different, but comparable procedure is used in *P.*8: lines 1-4 invoke Hesychia and the victory is dedicated to her in 5, where the victor is mentioned by name. What follows is a lengthy description of Hesychia's powers with mythical examples and gnomes. Only as late as line 18 we move back to the epinician stock themes. *N.*5 is completely different: here all the victory data are mentioned together in three lines right at the beginning of the ode (4-6) and we are plunged straightforwardly into the myth (9).

[84] The frustration of the audience's expectation for an Aeginetan myth is one of the ways in which *P.*8 creates tension. The audience may have anticipated a shift to Aegina's past after having heard lines 25-7. But 28 moves back to the present and 29-34 move back to the immediate occasion. Then, surprisingly, we get a myth from the Theban cycle. The Aeacids remain unmentioned, untill the very end of the poem (99-100).

[85] A similar frustration of the audience's expectations by means of suddenly breaking off the story occurs in *N.*5.14. But there the denial of expectation is double, because, after the break off, Pindar continues to allude to the story that he is not going to tell (15/6).

[86] It is easy to exonerate Pindar from the accusation of not doing exactly what he promises by interpreting Αἰακῶι ... γένει τε as a *hendiadys*. But this is exactly the type of non-linear interpretation that makes us insensitive to the effects of Pindar's words upon a listening audience. The point is that they, when they hear line 28 and do not know what is to follow, have reason to believe that Aeacus will be dealt with.

One could go on by pointing out how the detailed account of Achilles' youth may have been novel to the audience, how the explicit ascription of this story to earlier authorities (52/3) must have surprized them, and how similar techniques continue to be used until the very end of the ode—, but the picture will be clear.

Bacchylides shares Pindar's concern for creating suspense and manipulating the audience's expectancies. But his techniques are different. His opening hymns are much shorter than Pindar's, the longest being a mere fourteen short lines,[87] which is an indication that creation of suspense by means of postponing encomiastic stock themes was not his main concern. In fact, he mentions the victor's name, as a rule, early in his odes: always in the first strophe, excepting 9 (where Automedes is first mentioned in the first epode), 5, and 11 (both having the victor's name at the beginning of the first antistrophe; we cannot be sure about 1, 8, 10, 12, and 13). Break-offs occur only twice in the extant odes: 5.176-9, and 10.51/2, passages that are remarkably void of any emotional dimension to the sudden break, especially in contrast to Pindar. Bacchylides' creates suspense primarily in his narratives, especially in his abrupt terminations of his myths.[88]

Variations of Mood[89]

In the *Laws* Plato characterizes the contemporal practice of choral lyric competition as follows: χορὸc οὐχ εἷc ἀλλὰ πλῆθοc χορῶν ἥκει ... ῥήμαcί τε καὶ ῥυθμοῖc καὶ γοωδεcτάταιc ἁρμονίαιc cυντείνοντεc τὰc τῶν ἀκροωμένων ψύχαc, καὶ ὃc ἂν δακρῦcαι μάλιcτα τὴν θύcαcαν παραχρῆμα ποιήcῃ πόλιν, οὗτοc τὰ νικητήρια φέρει (800c/d). The effect of a choral lyric performance on the audience, as Plato describes it, is emotive. Although Plato's account is without doubt exaggerated, it shows that choral lyric performances were appreciated by the audience (and disapproved of by Plato) for their strong emotional impact.[90]

---

[87] On Bacchylides' opening hymns, see Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, p. 276; Carey, *Mnemosyne* 33, 1980, 15/6; Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 181-6.

[88] Examples include odes 15, 16, 18, 5, and 17. Cf. Platter, *AJPh* 115, 1994, 339 with n. 4; see further the contributions of Carey and Pfeijffer in *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides*. In that work I should have drawn attention to the fact that the beginning of the Introduction has been inspired by an unpublished lecture of Glenn Most.

[89] Much in this section I owe to an unfortunately unpublished paper by C. Carey, 'Pindar in Performance'. The basic idea as well as most of the examples discussed here are his.

[90] In the *Ion*, Socrates characterizes the current concept of an ideal rhapsodic performance as ὅταν εὖ εἴπῃc ἔπη καὶ ἐκπλήξῃc τοὺc θεωμένουc. Ion agrees wholeheartedly and elaborates: ἐγὼ γὰρ ὅταν ἐλεινόν τι λέγω, δακρύων ἐμπίμπλαμαι μου οἱ

Through our intellectualizing way of reading Pindar we run the risk of neglecting the emotional dimension of his texts. The concepts and ideas presented to the audience often fall into larger sections evoking different emotions. And the audience would experience an ode both as a succession of statements and ideas and as a composition of shifting tones and moods, appreciating it intellectually as well as emotionally. The very scope of a victory ode and its variegated nature, integrating many different elements, give Pindar the opportunity to bring about sudden shifts in the mood, effecting contrasting emotions in his audience.

This technique of creating suspense and attentiveness by constantly varying the emotional mood is exploited to a high degree in *P.*8. The ode opens with an invocation of Hesychia, Tranquility, and her gentle powers are described in the first lines. Then, in line 8, the mood changes suddenly. We are presented with a fierce and aggressive side of the deity, unrelentingly punishing her enemies. This leads over into references to Porphyrion and Typhos, scary monsters that were once a threat to the world order. The reference to their being killed by Zeus and Apollo (17/8) brings the grim atmosphere to a climax. Then this same Apollo serves as the hinge of a sudden shift of mood to the joy of the victory and the current festive occasion. Note that εὐμενεῖ νόωι in 18 underscores the sudden emotional shift very effectively, and that Κίρραθεν ἐcτεφανωμένον | ... ποίαι Παρναccίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμωι (19/20) vividly takes us back to the scene of the victory. The narrative section of this ode has comparable shifts of tone. In lines 44-7 we are presented with a proud picture of martial prowess and success. In line 48 καμὼν προτέραι πάθαι gives us a glimpse of the disaster of the previous expedition, but the subsequent lines focus on the success of the current one again (49-51). But then there is a sudden shift of mood, when the death of Adrastus' son is predicted in pictorial terms (51-5, esp. θανόντος ὀcτέα λέξαις υἱοῦ, 53). χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτός in 56 then suddenly changes the atmosphere completely. The evocation of the current victory celebrations in line 57 brings us back to the joy of this festive occasion. The

---

ὀφθαλμοί· ὅταν τε φοβερὸν ἢ δεινόν, ὀρθαὶ αἱ τρίχες ἵcτανται ὑπὸ φόβου καὶ ἡ καρδία πηδᾶι. He aims at effecting the same in his audience: καθορῶ γὰρ ἑκάcτοτε αὐτοὺc ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος κλάοντάc τε καὶ δεινὸν ἐμβλέποντας καὶ cυνθαμβοῦντας τοῖc λεγομένοις (535b-e). Again the emphasis is entirely on the emotional effects of a performance. See also Pl.*R.*605c-6c, *Phileb.*48a, etc. Plato is a hostile witness. But other authors do not disagree with him on this point: cf., e.g., Hdt.6.21, Isoc.2.49, 9.10, 4.168, Aeschin.3.153, X.*Symp.*3.11, etc. On the emotional dimension of tragic performance see esp. Heath, *Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, pp. 5-31, 37-89.

final triad again swings the audience back and forth between contrasting emotions. The unrelenting superiority and the success of the victor (81/2) is contrasted by a pictorial description of the losers' misery (83-7). Then again a description of the happiness caused by success follows (88-92). This leads over into a gnomic account about the instability of fate with much emphasis on the negative side (92-6). Lines 96/7 then focus on the happiness of victory again.

*P.*8 is a very clear example. But almost every ode has some sudden changes in the emotional mood. Other examples include *N.*5.9-16, where the harmony of the three sons of Aeacus praying together is suddenly broken by allusions to Peleus' and Telamon's murder of their half-brother; *P.*1-1-28, where the mood of rest and peace, of power sleeping because of the enchantment of music, is shattered in line 13, where we move to the enemies of the gods; *P.*12.1-17, where the description of the joy of victory is followed by the horror of Medusa, etc.

Pindar's concern for emotional effects is of course nothing special. He shares this concern with most Greek poets, if not with most artists in any field. Bacchylides exploits *pathos*, perhaps even more so than Pindar (the frequency of emotionally charged adjectives in Bacchylides is noteworthy).[91] But, unlike Pindar, he does not seem to have aimed at sudden, unexpected variations of evoked emotions. And in this respect Pindar is special. His general tendency towards variation, ποικιλία, towards striking his audience with unexpected changes of direction, is also visible on the level of the emotional moods he evokes.

Variations of Tempo

'Tempo' is a feature inherent to many aspects of the performance of a Pindaric ode. Most of these are lost beyond reconstruction. We do not have the metronome measures of his music, we do not know the pace of the movements of his choreographies. The two do not necessarily converge. Metre tells us nothing about tempo. Sequences of long and short syllables can be spoken out at any pace.[92] The fact that in a triadic ode the metre is the same for every single system

---

[91] On *pathos* in Bacchylides see now esp. C. Carey, 'Ethos and Pathos in Bacchylides', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of the Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999.

[92] West says: "Short syllables cannot support undue lengthening in delivery" (*Greek Music*, p. 154). But the length of syllables is a relative notion.

does not prove that such an ode was performed in one, unvarying tempo. The same rhytmical structures can be taken at different tempi.[93] Aristid. Quint. p. 40.1 speaks of change of tempo as one type of rhythmic modulation.[94]

But there is also such a thing as 'tempo of information,' the 'pace' of content. Defined provisionally this is the amount of information provided related to the time it takes to provide it. This has much to do with the length of so-called 'idea units,' or 'information units.'[95] A staccato succession of short information units constitutes a rapid tempo (an example is ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὔ τις; cκιᾶc ὄναρ | ἄνθρωποc, *P.*8.95/6, a succession of four information units consisting of no more than 17 syllables). The tempo slows when information units are expanded, e.g, when more or longer words are used, or more adjectives are provided, i.e., when it takes more time to impart a self-contained unit of information (an example is πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲc θραcυμαχάνων τε λεόντων | ὄνυχαc ὀξυτάτουc ἀκμὰν | καὶ δεινοτάτων cχάcαιc ὀδόντων | ἔγαμεν ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρεΐδων, *N.*4.62-5). Pindar's tendency towards ποικιλία, variation in the course of the linear development of his odes, is reflected by changes of tempo. E.g., the stately description of the Island of the Blest in *O.*2.70-80, consisting of relatively long information units, is followed by an acceleration of tempo when Achilles' achievements are summarized in four short, staccato statements which draw the narrative to a close (81-3). Similarly, in *O.*13.87-90, Pindar relates Bellerophon's killing of the Amazons, the Chimaera, and the Solymi in increasingly shorter phrases that increase the tempo and draw the narrative to a close. In *O.*9.67/8, Pindar records the numerous immigrants who came to Opous in five short units (ἀγίκοντο δέ οἱ ξένοι | ἔκ τ' Ἄργεοc, ἔκ τε Θηβᾶν, οἱ δ' Ἀρκάδεc, οἱ δὲ καὶ Πιcᾶται), and then, as the tempo slows, the audience is led to concentrate on the most important one (υἱὸν δ' Ἄκτοροc ἐξόχωc τίμαcεν ἐποίκων | Αἰγίναc τε Μενοίτον, 69/70). The latter procedure, *ritenuto* in order to single out the most important element in a series, is especially effective in priamels (cf., e.g., *O.*1.1-7, *O.*3.42-4, *O.*11.1-6, *N.*8.37-9, *P.*1.75-80, etc.; see esp. Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 9-16).

---

[93] Aristox.*Harm.*2.34 and *fr. ap.* Porph. in Ptol.*Harm.* pp. 78/9 (pp. 32-4 Pearson); Aristid.Quint. p. 39.26ff. (references given by West, *Greek Music*, p. 153 n. 62).

[94] On tempo see further West, *Greek Music*, pp. 153-7.

[95] See W. Chafe, 'The Deployment of Conciousness in the Production of a Narrative', *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production* (W. Chafe ed.), Norwood (NJ) 1980; 'Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing and Oral Literature', *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy* (D. Tannen ed.), Norwood (NJ) 1982; E.J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric*

It is perhaps necessary to emphasise that the pace of content does not necessarily converge with the tempo of the music (or dance). The two are fundamentally detached movements. If Pindar's tendency towards variation is extrapolated to the realm of conjecture, one could imagine a situation in which the tempo of the music, the pace of the movements of the choreography and the tempo of information are three separate movements, varying independently and forming a constantly interwoven pattern of variation.

Word Order

Ever since Dionysius' characterisation of Pindaric style as ἐν πολλοῖϲ ὑπεροπτικὴ τῆϲ ἀκολουθίαϲ (D.H.*Comp.*22.150),[96] word order in Pindar's odes has been a source of amazement and often considered a poetic extravaganza of the most poetic of all poets;[97] as such it is admired by some,[98] for others a reason to disregard word order altogether. Statements like "an appeal to word-order ... does not prove very much in the case of Pindar's poetry"[99] are symptomatic of the latter attitude.

Those who accept the challenge of trying to understand something of word order in Pindar tend to do so in aesthetic terms. Some attempted to find the explanation for unusual word order in ensuing sound effects;[100] others give ingenious *ad hoc* explanations in terms of iconicity, which are as sensitive as they are subjective. An example is Gildersleeve's observation on ὕδατοϲ ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοιϲαν εἰϲ ἀκμὰν | μαχαίραι τάμον κατὰ μέλη, *O.*1.48/9: "the position of the words shows impatience and horror" (p. 133). Many attack Pindar's word order with the instruments of classical oratory, discerning chiasms, hyberbata, etc., labels which, in appealing to generally acknowl-

---

Discourse, Ithaca & London 1996, 47 and *passim*; S.R. Slings, 'Information Unit and Metrical Unit', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of the Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999.

[96] Cf. also Eustath.*Prooem.*11/2 (III 290/1 Dr.).

[97] "Decantata ista Pindari audacia nulla in re perinde apparet atque in speciosa verborum conlocatione, in qua certe omnium Graecorum maximum sibi licentiam permisit", Harre, p. 3.

[98] "So ist es den Chorlyrikern möglich, ein Mosaik von Worten zu schaffen, wo jedes Wort als Klang, als Ort, als Begriff nach rechts und links und über das Ganze hin seine Kraft ausströmt, ein Minimum in Umfang und Zahl der Zeichen, ein Maximum an Energie der Zeichen" (Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, 107).

[99] Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367. "It is well-known that the order of words is often very free in Pindar" (Verdenius on *O.*7.1, I p. 42).

[100] F.F.P. Harre, *De verborum apud Pindarum conlocatione*, Diss. Berlin 1867; see also Gildersleeve, p. cxiv.

edged aesthetics, create the illusion of actually explaining something.[101] The latter approach reached its zenith in the study of A.-I. Sulzer, *Zur Wortstellung und Salzbildung bei Pindar*, Diss. Zürich 1961, who tries to depict graphically how words belonging together embrace other words, how hyperbata are combined with chiasms, etc. Her typographical *tour de force* certainly has an aesthetic appeal in itself, but hardly describes the effect that word order must have had upon an audience who heard the odes as they were being performed, at one stretch, from the beginning to the end.

On a very basic level, unusual word order aims at being unusual. Unusual word order has the effect of giving the text an aura of delicacy, the unusual being perceived as special. Moreover, unusual word order is comparable to Pindar's general tendency towards implicitness in that it makes higher demands on the concentration and intellect of the hearer. Considering word order in a linear way, projecting oneself into the position of an audience who heard the text as it was performed, makes clear that, apart from serving these general purposes, manipulation of word order often involves manipulation of tension and of the listener's expectancies, both on a syntactic and on a pragmatic level.[102] This can be illustrated from ἔννεπε κρυφᾶι τιϲ αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων, | ὕδατοϲ ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοιϲαν εἰϲ ἀκμὰν | μαχαίραι τάμον κατὰ μέλη, | τραπέζαιϲί τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν | ϲέθεν διεδάϲαντο καὶ φάγον, *O.*1.47-51. In line 48, the prolepsis of ὕδατοϲ effects tension (on a syntactic level) because the hearer is waiting for the constituent with which he is to construe it. Every single word following in this line maintains and increases this syntactic tension in sofar as further syntactically different constituents are given which cannot be construed until the hearer hears ἀκμάν, at which point ὕδατοϲ, πυρί, ζέοιϲαν, and εἰϲ fall into place. But the clause is not yet syntactically complete at this point. We still need a main verb. μαχαίραι further postpones the verb. With τάμον the first of the two clauses coordinated[103] with τε ... τ' could in itself be complete. κατὰ μέλη is then added. The postponement of this pictorial detail adds to its saliency. The second of the two clauses, and indeed the entire sentence, could be syntactically complete with διεδάϲαντο. καὶ φάγον is then added. This is the most gruesome and most incriminating detail of the story. The fact that it is singled out at the very end of a sentence that could be syntactically

---

[101] Gildersleeve, pp. cxiv/v.

[102] See Helma Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 5), Diss. Amsterdam 1995.

[103] Christ, *Dialekte*, pp. 4-5 argued that τε in 48 is a second person pronoun. But see Gerber, *ad loc.* (p. 84).

complete without its being added gives it a great emphasis, which is a pragmatic effect. For further examples see my analyses of *N.*3.76-80 (pp. 395/6), *N.*3.12/3 (pp. 268/9), *P.*8.53 (pp. 538/9).

Pindar's concern for tension and suspense is visible also on the smallest scale. One could analyse an entire ode in terms of tightening and slackening syntactic tension. Pragmatic effects aimed at by unusual word order that manipulates the hearer's linear perception of the sequence of notions referred to are visible throughout the corpus, and for the three odes commented upon in this book, they will be given attention in the appropriate notes. The difference between Pindaric word order and what is found in prose writers like Herodotus or Xenophon is fundamental. Whereas the latter are primarily concerned with bringing across their message as clearly as possible, word order serving the pragmatic needs of the reader, Pindar places the pragmatic needs of his audience second to the creation of special effects, his main concern being bringing across his message in a very special and highly effective way.

'Inconcinnitas'

Inconcinnitas is the use of unlike syntactical constructions to express ideas which are parallel with respect to their contents. The relative frequency of syntactical assymmetry in Pindar has often been noted as a distinctive characteristic of Pindar's style, and is well documented as such.[104] Examples range from variation of prepositions (e.g. ἐπὶ πάcαc ὁλκάδοc ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι, *N.*5.2; ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸc ἥρωαc αἰχματὰc φυτευθένταc καὶ ἀπὸ χρυcεᾶν Νηρηΐδων, *N.*5.7; παρὰ πεζοβόαιc ἵπποιc τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαιc, *N.*9.34, etc.), to asymmetry in parallel word groups (ἅ τε παρθενηΐοιc παίδων τ' ἐφίζοιcα γλεφάροιc, *N.*8.3, etc.), to variation of particles (e.g. τοῖc οὔτε νόcτοc ὁμῶc | ἔπαλπνοc ἐν Πυθιάδι κρίθη, | οὐδὲ μολόντων πὰρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλωc γλυκὺc | ὦρcεν χάριν, *P.*8.83-6; ἐμὲ δὲ πρέπει παρθενήϊα μὲν φρονεῖν | γλώccαι τε λέγεcθαι, *fr.*94b.33-5, etc.) to the large scale syntactical lay-out of sentences (e.g. φυᾶι δ' ἕκαcτοc διαφέρομεν βιοτὰν λαχόντεc | ὁ μὲν τά, τὰ δ' ἄλλοι, *N.*7.54/5; ἐν βάccαιcιν Ἰcθμοῦ δεξαμένωι cτεφάνουc, τὰ δὲ κοίλαι λέοντοc | ἐν βαθυcτέρνου νάπαι κάρυξε Θήβαν, *I.*3.11/2; τοὺc μὲν μαλακαῖc ἐπαοιδαῖc ἀμφέπων, | τοὺc δὲ προcανέα πίνονταc, ἢ γυίοιc περάπτων πάντοθεν | φάρμακα, τοὺc δὲ τομαῖc ἔcταcεν ὀρθούc, *P.*3.51-3, etc.).[105] The ancient grammarians regard *inconcinnitas* as charcteristic

---

[104] See especially Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, pp. 103-9; Poultney, *AJPh* 108, 1987, 1-8.

[105] Further examples are to be found in the works cited.

for the αὐστηρὰ ἁρμονία and as aiming at an imitation of natural, i.e., unstudied and simple, speech, as opposed to the neatly balanced antitheses of periodical style.[106] Dornseiff says that Pindar avoids syntactical symmetry in order to effect ποικιλία.[107] There is an element of truth in both explanations. Syntactical asymmetry is both a stylized imitation of the unpremeditated structures of ex tempore speech, and one of the most obvious examples of Pindar exerting himself to avoid the obvious. Thus Pindar's frequent use of *inconcinnitas* ties in both with his concern for creating the illusion of spontaneity (on the level of the fiction of the poet creating his text spontaneously on the very spot), and (on the level of the poet who actually composes his texts with great skill, carefully calculating their effects upon his audience) with his general tendency towards unpredictability and, by making high demands upon the concentration of his audience, hightening of its attentiveness and its active involvement in the performance.

Metre

Succession of themes, development, variations, contrapunto, and modulations are means by which western music creates and manipulates expectations on the part of the hearer and constitutes tension and suspense. Pindar's melodies are lost beyond reconstruction. But we do have the rhythm. The metre of Pindar's odes is not a static structure, imposed upon his odes as the lid of a box of sorting blocks with slots for long and short syllables, constitutive of a formal restriction for the poet to comply with; metre, too, happens in the dimension of time, and is perceived as a dynamic, linear development of themes and variations. And a close look at Pindar's rhythms from a linear perspective, adopting the viewpoint of a musicologist rather than that of a philologist who prints a scheme above his text, shows that they too play with expectations on the part of the listener, in a way not unsimilar to well known and well documented procedures in western classical music. Such an analysis has been attempted for the three odes commented upon (pp. 92-7, 234-40, 460-6).

---

[106] See especially D.H.*Comp*.22.

[107] "Überhaupt jedes Ebenmaß im Sprachlichen und in der Gliederung der Teile meidet die pindarische Dichtung, wie um den stark ausgeprägten musikalisch-strophischen Parallelismus das Starre zu nehmen und ihn durch Buntheit zu übertönen.", Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, p. 103. However, I do not believe that Pindar felt the need to compensate for the dullness ensuing from the strophic repetition of his metrical and musical schemes, as will be clear from my next section.

Pindar's Style: Towards a Synthesis

The most eye-catching characteristics of Pindar's style are results of three tendencies: a tendency towards diversity, implicitness, and spontaneity by means of a fictional mimesis of ex tempore speech. Each one of these three aims at effects that are in themselves desirable. The vividness that results from diversity and variation is an aesthetic aim in itself. Implicitness aims at increasing the audience's attentiveness, concentration, and intellectual pleasure, and is as such in itself positively valued. This fiction of spontaneity as such contributes to the encomiastic aims of the victory odes, to the extent that it camouflages the formality of the occasion and the coldness of the contractual relationship, and presents the praise the victor is getting as a voluntary outpouring of pure joy that is incited by nothing but his accomplishment.

However, these tendencies are not to be seen as independent and unrelated objectives. They mutually imply and reinforce one another. The fiction of extemporizing speech eases transitions and thus allows the poet to accommodate the length of sections to his aims, to deal with certain themes, tales or events without the need to develop his treatment beyond his requirements and then plunge into a different theme. Thus the fictional imitation of spontaneous text production provides the poet with a valuable tool for effecting diversity, for easily combining disparate material, and for constantly playing with the audience's expectations and holding them in a firm grip by always proceeding in a slightly or entirely different way than they expect. That Pindar tends to be implicit about the relevance of the various sections in a poem and about how they cohere is not only a highly sophisticated poetical technique for intensifying the audience's attentiveness and for increasing the intellectual pleasure they have in discovering levels of relevance and coherences on their own without the help of explicit guidance by the text; it is also a manifestation of the fiction of spontaneity. The poet pretends that the subsequent different sections of his song leap in his mind at the spot, as uncontrived associations. He can be implicit about their coherence because, on the level of this fictional spontaneity, he does not know how they cohere himself. Thus his concerns for variation and implicitness are sublimized in a fiction of spontaneity. It is this fictional mimesis of ex tempore speech that is possibly Pindar's most ingenious invention, because it transforms the main limitation of the genre, i.e., the requirement for the integration of disparate material, into an advantage: it enables the poet to change his direction at any point, leaving implicit his intricate pattern of layers of relevance and

coherence; it enables him to present his audience with an unpredictable and stunning sequence of themes, stories, ideas, and emotions, which make the performance of a Pindaric ode an experience.

DIFFERENT READINGS

Nemean V

	Snell-Maehler	*Bowra*	*this commentary*
header	⟨ΑΓΕΝΕΙΩΙ⟩ ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΑCΤΗΙ	ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΑCΤΗΙ	ΑΓΕΝΕΙΩΙ ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΑCΤΗΙ
6	τερείναc	τερείναc	τέρειναν
17	ἀτρεκέc	ἀτρεκήc	ἀτρεκέc
30	ἦρα	ἦρα	ἆρα
31	νιν	νιν	μιν
38	νιν	νιν	μιν
43	ἤτοι μεταΐξαιc cὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸc μάτρωc ἀγάλλει	ἤτοι μεταΐξαντα καὶ νῦν τεὸc μάτρωc ⟨c'⟩ ἀγάλλει	ἤτοι μεταΐξαιc cὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸc μάτρωc ἀγάλλει
52	παγκρατίου	παγκρατίωι	παγκρατίου
54	φέρε	φέρε	φέρειν

Nemean III

	Snell-Maehler	*Bowra*	*this commentary*
10	οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ,	, οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλᾳ κρέοντι θύγατερ,	, οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ,
11	νιν	νιν	μιν
12	κοινάcομαι	κοινάcομαι	κοινώcομαι
14	ἀγοράν	εἶραν	ἀγοράν
15	τεάν	τεὰν	γ' ἑὰν
27	παραμείβεαι	παραμείβειc	παραμείβηιc
34	καὶ Ἰαολκὸν	κἰαολκὸν	καὶ Ἰαολκὸν
39	νίν	νίν	μίν
41	ψεφεννὸc	ψεφεννὸc	ψεφηνὸc
53	ἔχω·	ἔχω·	ἔχω.
76	ἄπεccι	ἄπεcτι	ἄπεcτι
76	χαῖρε, φίλοc·	χαῖρε, φίλοc·	χαῖρε· φίλοc

Pythian VIII

	Snell-Maehler	*Bowra*	*this commentary*
header	ΠΑΛΑΙϹΤΗΙ	ΠΑΛΑΙϹΤΗΙ	ΠΑΙΔΙ ΠΑΛΑΙϹΤΗΙ
16	νιν	νιν	μιν
32	κνίϲηι	κνίξηι	κνίϲηι
72	ἄφθονον	ἄφθονον	ἄφθιτον
76-77	δαίμων δὲ παρίϲχει· ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων, ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν,	δαίμων δὲ παρίϲχει, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων, ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν.	δαίμων δὲ παρίϲχει, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων· ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν,
78	μέτρωι καταβαίνει·	μέτρωι καταβαίν'· ἐν	μέτρωι καταβαίνει.

NEMEAN V

DATE AND HISTORICAL SETTING

Date

As I have argued in detail in my 'The Date Pindar's Fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' Thirteenth Ode', *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-332, both odes for Pytheas' Nemean pancration victory are to be dated to 487 B.C. They were performed while Aegina was fighting an all-out war against Athens.

An analysis of the victory catalogues of the four odes written for the sons of Lampon shows that 485 B.C. is the latest possible date for Pindar's fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' thirteenth ode. Certain passages in both odes indicate that they were performed while Aegina was at war with Athens (see my notes on lines 19, 46-50; for B.13.182-9 and 199-209 see *art. cit.* pp. 327-9). Pindar unequivocally declares his solidarity with Aegina against Athens, whereas Bacchylides appeals to his impartial *ethos* of Panhellenic epinician poet, presenting the general principles of his profession as surpassing momentary conflicts between two *poleis*. The Athenian-Aeginetan war described by Herodotus (6.73, 85-93) gives a historical setting that accounts for these passages, as well as for some of the thematic characteristics of B.13 and *N.*5. This war took place after the death of Cleomenes, the earliest possible date of which is winter 490/489 B.C., and at least several months after the ambush of the Athenian *theoris* to Sounion, which may be dated to spring 489 or 488 B.C. This results in either 489 or 487 B.C. as the date of Pytheas' Nemean victory. 489 as the date for Pytheas' victory seems to imply a somewhat overstrained chronological scheme. This would not be the case if summer 487 B.C. is taken as the date for Pytheas' victory. Moreover, this date has the advantage of concurring exactly with the oracle recorded in Hdt.5.89.

Historical Setting

The naval rivalry between Athens and Aegina is well known. Herodotus (5.81) speaks of a πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος in this connection, which is generally taken as referring to some kind of unorganized piratical warfare, consisting of irregular raids on each other's ships

and coastal areas.[1] This situation of mutual hostility escalated into a fierce war, described by Herodotus in book 6 (73, 85-93). The gist of his narrative is as follows:

Cleomenes and Leotychidas, Kings of Sparta, took ten of the most esteemed Aeginetans as hostages, including the two most powerful men. They were entrusted to the Athenians, because Athens was Aegina's fiercest enemy (73). Shortly after Cleomenes' death the Aeginetans sent messengers to Sparta, in order to get back the hostages. Leotychidas agreed to co-operate, and he went to Athens to demand the hostages back (85). However, the Athenians refused and Leotychidas left Athens without success (86). The Aeginetans captured an Athenian procession ship, near Sounion, carrying θεωροί, whom they took prisoner (87). Because of suffering this insult, the Athenians began an all-out war against Aegina. They laid a plot with an Aeginetan of high birth, Nicodromus, who had been exiled by the Aeginetan rulers. He planned to give Aegina over to the Athenians. They agreed upon an appointed moment in time when their forces would come and help him. In the meanwhile, he conspired with the δῆμοc against the Aeginetan rulers (91) and captured the so-called old city (88). But the Athenian troops arrived one day late (89). Nicodromus and his followers fled and took refuge in Sounion (90). The Aeginetan rulers arrested seven hundred of Nicodromus' followers and butchered them (91). After this setback the Athenians attacked Aegina once again and defeated the Aeginetan fleet. Aegina called upon the Argives to come to their help. Argos sent one thousand volunteers. A battle took place on the island and most of the Argive force was slain (92). The Aeginetan fleet attacked the Athenian ships, which were not in battle-order, and captured four of them, including their crews (93).

The references to a war between Aegina and Athens in *N.*5 and B.13 are hardly understandable in a situation of unorganized piratical warfare, which may have existed from the late sixth century onward. The harsh treatment of Menander in *N.*5.48-50, and especially the emphatic portrayal of the *entire* state fighting for things worth fighting for (ἐcλοῖcι μάρναται πέρι πᾶcα πόλιc, *N.*5.47) implies a more

---

[1] According to H.W. Singor, *Oorsprong en betekenis van de hoplietenphalanx in het archaische Griekenland*, Diss. (Leiden, 1988), pp. 241-5, a πόλεμοc ἀκήρυκτοc is not a war that has not officially been declared, but a war that was unimpeded by any formal regulations, an all-out war in which anything was allowed. If this is true, Herodotus' qualification can hardly apply to the war following the events of 506, which merely consisted of Aeginetan raids on the Attic coasts, while Athens did not strike back (5.81, 89-90). See *art. cit.*, pp. 329-31.

serious conflict than that.[2] The all-out war, especially the hard fighting described in 92-3, would be exactly the type of situation that would explain these far-reaching statements. For the discussion about the date of this war see *art. cit.*, pp. 329-31; further references are to be found therein.

---

[2] This phrase excludes the (in itself unlikely) possibility of Pindar referring to the war following the events of 506.

INTERPRETATION

Proem

Pindar captures his audience's attention immediately. The ode opens with a stunning statement: 'I am no maker of statues.' In accordance with the principle set out in the opening lines of *O*.6, the beginning of the poem is eye-catching and brilliant. While Pindar emphasizes the permanence of his odes elsewhere by comparing them to monuments (*N*.4.81, *N*.8.46-8), the opening lines of this ode emphasize the advantages of song over actual monuments. The rhetoric aims at emphasizing the capacity of song of traveling and spreading the victor's fame to his contemporaries abroad. The present song is urged to embark on every ὁλκάϲ and every ἄκατοϲ leaving Aegina's harbours and to proclaim the victor's fame and glory all over the world (2-8). πάϲαϲ (2) underscores the wide impact of Pindar's song and is suggestive of the size of the Aeginetan fleet. Pindar associates the spreading of the victor's fame with the radius of action of Aeginetan ships, thus presenting Aegina's naval activity as contributing to the victor's and the island's fame and glory: both men and ships contribute to Aegina's fame; moreover, the ships help to spread Aegina's fame around the world. The two ingredients of Aegina's grandeur are connected in line 9.[1]

Lines 4-6 give the mandatory victory data in rapid succession: Pytheas, son of Lampon, has won the pancration contest in Nemea in the category of ἀγένειοι. By being victorious, Pytheas provides the Aeacids, his ancestors, and his mother-city[2] with a γέραϲ (7/8). Aegina is called φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν, a 'land belonging to strangers.' ξενία is of paramount importance to a society depending primarily on naval activity.[3] It is essential for maritime trade as a guar-

---

[1] In line 4 the victor is called εὐρυϲθενής, which in Homer is a fixed Homeric epithet of Poseidon. Although Pindar's usage of the adjective is more flexible than Homer's, the nautical context here helps evoke the Homeric associations with Poseidon. The association of the victor with the god of the seas is functional in that it connects athletic prowess with naval activity, a theme that is very much present in the opening lines of this ode.

[2] ματρόπολιν (8) evokes associations with colonization (cf. *P*.4.19/20); some sort of 'colonization' is alluded to in lines 15/6. In fact, it may be regarded as a compliment, or a euphemism, to associate Peleus' exile to Phthia and Telamon's exile to Salamis with Aeginetan colonization.

[3] For Aegina's naval supremacy cf. Hdt.2.178, 4.152, Ephor.*FrGrHist*.70 F 176, Arist.*Pol*.1291b17ff., Paus.8.5.8, *Corpus Paroemiog. Gr.* I 268, Σ.*ad* *O*.8.29b; see also

antee for the safety of ships and crew in foreign harbours.[4] ξενία is (like, e.g., χάρις, φιλία and αἰδώς) fundamentally at home in reciprocal relationships.[5] Consciousness of their dependence on ξενία abroad prompted the Aeginetans to adhere emphatically to the principle with respect to foreign visitors in their own harbours. The reciprocity of ξενία makes it understandable for the Aeginetan elite to pride itself emphatically on its hospitality.[6] ξενία will turn out to be a major theme in this ode.

Myth

9-13 *First Episode: The Three Sons of Aeacus Praying Together*

With the relative pronoun in line 9 we slip into the heroic past. Standing at the altar of Zeus Hellenius, the three Aeacids, Peleus, Telamon, and Phocus,[7] prayed that Aegina be noble in men and renowned in ships (9-13). The suggestion is that their prayer has been fulfilled: Aegina rears excellent men, witnessing Pytheas' recent victory, and is renowned for its naval supremacy. Men and ships contribute to Aegina's fame; and, as the proem thematizes, the ships help spread the fame of Aegina's men around the world. The reference to Zeus Hellenius in line 10 evokes the story of Aeacus hosting the envoys of all Greek states, who came to beg him to pray to his father for rain when all of Greece was suffering from drought and infertility. This story of Aeacus hosting envoys from every part of Greece can be regarded as the 'historical' example of Aegina's hospitality.

Performing rites together has a socializing effect. It reinforces social ties and gives a feeling of solidarity. ἁμᾶ, emphatically placed at the end of the clause, stresses the solidarity of Peleus and Telamon with their half-brother Phocus. There is a strong contrast between the picture presented here and the story of Peleus and Telamon

---

Winterscheidt, 51ff.; H. Michell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 19572, 236; T.J. Figueira, *Aegina*, Salem 1981, 166-70, 230ff.; H.-J. Gehrke, *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das Dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*, München 1986, 172-4; Amit, *Great and Small Poleis*, 9-16.

[4] Cf. "Pindar's emphasis ... upon the good conduct of the Aeginetans towards strangers is moreover independent testimony to the large-scale trade of the island in the first part of the fifth century", Amit, *Great and Small Poleis*, 10.

[5] Cf. D.L. Cairns, *Aidôs*, Oxford 1993, pp. 158/9, 184/5, index *s.v.* 'guest-friendship.'

[6] For a more detailed discussion see Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 324-32.

[7] Not, of course, "*un groupe de statues d'orants*," as Froidefond, *Lire Pindare*, p. 82, believes (his italics).

murdering their half-brother Phocus alluded to in the following lines.[8] Just as the breach of solidarity is explicitly reprobated in the following lines, the concord of the three brothers is commended, both implicitly by contrast and because the prayer undertaken in concord has been fulfilled.

14-18 *Break-Off: 'Skipping' a Story of Fratricide*

In line 14 the poet intrudes into his own narrative, says it turned out to be ugly, and breaks it off in order to steer his ode in a different direction: 'Shame prevents me from saying something big, something not hazarded in accordance with The Way It Should Be: how they left the famous island, and what deity drove the valiant men from Oenona. I shall halt' (14-6). The μέγα and ἐν δίκαι μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον underlying this passage is fratricide. Some in the past have taken Pindar's presentation to be genuine and concluded that he did in fact lose control over his ode.[9] It is now well understood that this technique has a fictional dimension to it. We must distinguish the first person that is staged in the poems, the garrulous babbler Pindar pretends to be for the sake of creating the illusion that he composed his text on the spot, from the poet who actually crafted highly intricate odes with great care and skill. The poetic first person is the fictional mimesis of an ex tempore speaker (see Introduction, pp. 34-7). On the level of this fiction, his mentioning Phocus in the preceding lines evokes the association with fratricide; he shrinks back from this thought and says that he is not going to tell this tale. For the element of irony in this passage, see Introduction, pp. 36/7. As with all manifestations of the 'oral subterfuge,' the break-off creates an illusion of spontaneity. The poet pretends to create his song on the spot, and thus camouflages the highly complex and artificial nature of his poetry. Moreover, the implicitness of the reference to

---

[8] For Pindar's care for the emotive effects of variation of moods see Introduction, pp. 45-7.

[9] Farnell says: "Then Pindar behaves strangely. The name Phokos suggests to him the story why Peleus and Telamon had to leave Aegina. ... But it is an ugly tale, and Pindar, after alluding to it and in a veiled way reprobating the deed, shrinks from recounting it. He shrinks ... because it was a slur on the fair fame of the two great Aiakidai and would be strangely out of place on a genial and festive occasion. ... We do not understand why a poet with any control over his invention should bring us up to the very brink of the story and then recoil from it. ... But we are dealing with the most wayward and capricious of poets, and we cannot hope to account for all the flittings of his fancy. And his *faux pas*—if he regarded it as one—gave him the occasion for two good poetical aphorisms about Truth and Silence. And frequently he may have been too hurried to prune his ode." (I, pp. 187/8).

the fratricide creates an atmosphere of intimacy. Pindar says 'I am not going to tell this', without saying what he is not going to tell. The audience is left to guess, and of course they knew exactly what Pindar was alluding to; but that they have to find out for themselves is designed to increase their intellectual attentiveness and gives them a feeling of belonging to an incrowd (cf. my general remarks about implicitness, pp. 23-34 above).

In sum, the poet's tactful reticence is to be located on the level of the extemporizing fiction; on the level of his real compositional concerns the passage is designed exactly to conjure up the story of fratricide. This story is meant to have a relevance to Pindar's encomiastic aims.[10] As we observed, there is a contrast between this passage and the scene of the three brothers praying for Aegina's prosperity immediately preceding it. ἁμᾶ in 11 emphasizes the concord of the three Aeacids. The contrast is given a moral dimension in that the suggestion is that the prayer undertaken in solidarity has been fulfilled while the break-off rhetoric explicitly reprobates the breach of solidarity. The fratricide has a negative effect on Aegina because it results in the island losing two 'valiant men' (15). The association of the solidarity of the three Aeacids with the prosperity of Aegina as a whole suggests the passage is meant to have a relevance to the Aeginetan society.[11] It can be understood as an illustration of the

---

[10] Stern (*CPh* 66, 1971, 169-173) ingeniously argues that the function of the break-off is to establish a "similarity between the development of the mythical hero and that of the ode itself" (p. 173), in the sense that "the poem descends into the disastrous story of Phocus", and after "the poet's sudden shift in theme ... leads directly to his transference of poetical authority to Apollo and the Muses", and "it soon becomes impossible to determine where the song of the divine poets leaves off and that of Pindar reasserts itself", which is "a revitalization of the ode itself which parallels the revitalization of Peleus" (pp. 172/3). This boils down to the interpretation that Peleus' career from crime to hierogamy is paralleled neatly by the ode itself because it first tells about his murding Phocus, then about his marrying a goddess. Surely the quality of Pindar's poetry does not mirror this development. Stern's interpretation does not explain why it was functional in the first place to mention a less fortunate episode of Peleus' life. The answer that this is functional because it establishes a parallel to the development of the ode itself is mistaking the egg for the chicken. Less ingeniously Froidefond, *Lire Pindare*, p. 80, argues that: "la dispersion des éléments mythique, le caractère allusif et presque furtif du premier ..., la banalité du second ... suggèrent que le 'point focal' de l'ode se trouve ailleurs et, selon toute apparence, dans le προοίμιον."

[11] Dissen suggests that three Aeacids stand for the sons of Lampon, Pytheas and Phylacidas, young and promising athletes, and that the allusion to the murder of Phocus is a warning to both brothers not to fall victim to unfruitful emulation ("Quanquam autem Phylacidae consilium tecte tantum significari, nomen vero omnino non memorari potuit in hoc carmine, quem tamen convivarum epiniciis praesentium fugere potuisse censes sensum allusionis, quum ante oculos essent ambo fratres praeclari? ... utinam enim, ait, semper mala aemulatio absit ab his

thought that concord is preferable to internal conflict and thus as a recommendation to the Aeginetan audience not to turn against one another.

The relevance of internal Aeginetan concord as a theme in this victory ode for Pytheas will remain unclear unless we are willing to allow for the possibility that the theme derives its relevance from the historical setting of the performance of the ode. As I argued in *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32, the ode was performed during a war between Aegina and Athens. In general, internal solidarity is of vital importance in a situation of war, especially since this was an all-out war against the island's fiercest enemy. We know from Herodotus' account of the war (6.73, 85-93) that Athens laid a plot with an Aeginetan of high birth, Nicodromus, who had been exiled by the Aeginetan rulers, and that at least a considerable portion of the δῆμοϲ conspired with Nicodromus and the Athenian cause. Nicodromus and his followers were indeed successful to a certain extent: with the help of the δῆμοϲ they managed to capture the so-called old city (Hdt.6.88). It was only because the Athenian fleet failed to arrive at the appointed moment in order to assist them that their success was not definitive and that the παχέεϲ were able to restore their control over the island (6.89). Nicodromus and some of his followers fled and took refuge in Sounion (6.90); the Aeginetan rulers arrested no less than seven hundred of Nicodromus' followers of the δῆμοϲ and butchered them (6.91). The ode was with all probability performed in the period of the harsh fighting posterior to these events (described briefly in Hdt.6.92/3).[12]

The least committal conclusion is that the internal Aeginetan solidarity was an issue at the time of the performance of this ode. If we reconstruct what the situation was like in Aegina when this ode was performed, it is not difficult to imagine there was a great amount of tension. On the one hand, Aegina's arch-enemy Athens was ready to try and capture the island with might and main, a threat that called for a joining of all the Aeginetan forces available; on the other, the mutual mistrust between the δῆμοϲ and the παχέεϲ must have been tremendous. The recent slaughtering of seven hundred members of the δῆμοϲ by the aristocrat rulers was fresh in the audience's memories. It is in fact quite impossible to imagine that, in this situation, Pindar's story about Aeginetan fratricide was *not* under-

---

fratribus, neve dissidium gravius exsistat unquam turbetque fortunam eorum, qui ambo ad gloriam nati sunt," p. 411). Pindar is not implying, surely, that Pytheas was planning to murder his younger brother?

[12] Cf. my *CQ* 45, 1995, 329-31.

stood as an allusion to the recent outbursts of violence, Aeginetans killing fellow Aeginetans. This leads to the, at first sight, surprising conclusion that the act of violence by the aristocratic rulers, of which Pytheas' family was no doubt a prominent member, is indirectly characterized as a breach of solidarity and as μὴ ἐν δίκαι so as to be comparable to fratricide. Members of the δῆμος present in the audience will have applauded Pindar's presentation. This gives us a clue for what Pindar is aiming at here. His presentation makes sense if his objective were to reconcile the δῆμος with the aristocratic rulers, to win them back for the aristocratic Aeginetan cause in order to get their support which is indispensable in the light of the enormous threat clouding the island. It is unthinkable that Pindar would denounce the deeds of his commissioner on his own account, even if only indirectly. The evaluation of the events in the recent past must have concurred with the views of his commissioners. If their aim is to restore the δῆμος' solidarity with the ruling classes, the aim cannot easily be accomplished without first acknowledging the crime committed. Explicitly characterizing the brother murder, and thus indirectly the violence committed by the aristocratic rulers in the recent past, as μὴ ἐν δίκαι serves as a gesture of compromise and compensation towards the members of the δῆμος present in the audience.[13] Contrasting this breach of solidarity with the picture of the Aeacids praying in concord for Aegina's prosperity, a prayer that has been fulfilled as Pindar suggests, has the function of demonstrating the advantages of concord for Aegina's common good.

The poet's promise that he will not continue his present narrative thread (στάσομαι, 16) is followed by two gnomic statements which, on the level of the extemporizing fiction, serve as a justification for not relating the fratricide: 'It is not profitable when the whole truth displays her precise face; and being silent is often the wisest thing for a man to keep in mind' (16-8). φαίνοισα πρόσωπον involves a personification of ἀλάθεια. In this passage, she is depicted as a virtuous matron who must keep her head covered and must not unveil her face in public.[14] Her veiling her face is a manifestation of αἰδώς,[15] parallel to the poet's fictional αἰδώς which

[13] Cole, *Pindar's Feasts*, p. 60, recognizes that the episode about the fratricide has an element of "compromise and even compensation." However, he relates this to the events in 481 B.C., when the news of the arrival of Xerxes' army at Sardis led to the calling of a congres of anti-Medizing states at the Isthmus, where a (temporary) reconciliation between Athens and Aegina was brought about (Hdt.7.145.1; Cole, p. 43/4). But this date is untenable. See my *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32.

[14] For women's public veiling see now D.L. Cairns, *CQ* 46, 1996, 78-83, esp. pp. 80/1; further references are to be found therein (esp. nn. 16-21).

leads him to conceal ignoble deeds (cf. αἰδέομαι, 14). There is an element of paradox in this, since, obviously, ἀλάθεια normally is associated with the notion of *not* covering up, *not* concealing. Moreover, whereas αἰδώς and κέρδος are often opposed (cf. *N.*9.33, *N.*11.45-8, *P.*4.139-46, etc.), here αἰδώς brings κέρδος and is opposed to truth. This nexus of ideas will recur in the Peleus and Hippolyta story (see below).

19-21 *Transition*

In line 19, after the fictional skipping of the story of Peleus and Telamon murdering their half-brother Phocus (14-8), three examples are given of subjects that are laudable, fit the festive occasion, and that do rouse Pindar's enthusiasm as a poet of *epinicia*: 'happiness,' 'strength of hands,' and 'iron-clad war.' These subjects clearly are examples of laudable subjects in general. However, we are entitled to ask why these three examples are given in this particular ode; in other words, are these examples in any way related to the themes of this ode? This question has puzzled a number of interpretators.[16] It has been suggested that the three subjects mentioned in line 19 all apply to Peleus and are chosen in order to anticipate the main myth.[17] It is true that marrying a goddess and celebrating the wedding in the presence of divine guests is the greatest kind of ὄλβος a mortal can achieve (cf. *P.*3.89-95); it is true that Peleus displayed his χειρῶν βίαν when he had to struggle with Thetis turning herself into fire, water, a lion, and a serpent (cf. *N.*4.62-5, see my note on *N.*3.35/6, pp. 317/8); and it is true that Peleus later returned to Iolcus and fought a war with Acastus (cf. *N.*3.34 with my note, pp. 316/7). But, apart from the wedding on Mount Pelion (22-6), not one of these events is mentioned in this

[15] The opposition between 'truth' and 'silence' is frequent; but here it is paralleled by another frequent antithesis, that between αἰδώς and exposure: in other words αἰδώς / silence are opposed to exposure / truth. For veiling as an expression of αἰδώς, cf. πάλιν μου κρύψον κεφαλήν, | αἰδούμεθα γὰρ τὰ λελεγμένα μοι. | κρύπτε, E.*Hipp.*243-5; αἰδώς μ' ἔχει | εἰς ὄμματ' ἐλθεῖν τοῖσιν ἐξειργασμένοις, E.*Or.*460/1; E.*HF* 1159-62, *IT* 372-6, *Phoen.*1485-92; cf. also Pl.*Phaedr.*237a, Aesch.1.26. See further: R. Seaford in: *Masks of Dionysus* (T.H. Carpenter & C.A Faraone, edd.), Princeton 1993, 119/20; D.L. Cairns, *Aidôs*, Oxford 1993, 292/3; *CQ* 46, 1996, 80 with n. 16.

[16] E.g. Stern, *CPh* 66, 1971, 172: "Pindar ... turns to new themes, or at least appears to do so (vs. 19). But here too the poet sets a program which he does not follow. In general terms it might be said that Peleus achieves ὄλβος, but there is in the myth which follows no reference to war and physical might."

[17] Stoneman, *CQ* 26, 1976, 194/5.

ode. The choice of these three examples is motivated by their applying to the current situation.[18] χειρῶν βίαν ἐπαινῆcαι is in fact an apposite description of performing an ode for a victor in the pancration. ὄλβοc, too, applies to Pytheas, for one of the ways to ὄλβοc open to a man is a victory in the Great Games (cf. *N.*8.17, *O.*7.10). As this ode was performed during a war between Aegina and Athens, cιδαρίταν πόλεμον, likewise, has reference to the current situation.

Thus Pindar defines his program for this ode in terms of praising the victor's happiness, his athletic prowess, and praising Aegina for fighting a war against Athens. The former two themes clearly apply to the encomiastic purpose of the ode as a whole. The third theme applies at least to lines 46/7, where the poet does in fact praise Aegina in explicit terms for defending its cause against its formidable enemy. But, as we have seen and will see, Pindar's concern for the war is not limited to the one and a half lines where he explicitly declares his solidarity with the Aeginetan cause: the war permeates the ode as a whole. 'Iron-clad war' is by no means the odd man out; the rhetorical aim of winning back the δῆμοc for the aristocratic Aeginetan cause is closely intertwined with the encomiastic purpose of the ode as a whole. In fact, this line itself, in which the poet announces war as a theme for this ode, contributes to his rhetorical aim in that it presents the war against Athens as something laudable in a situation in which a considerable portion of the δῆμοc was not quite willing to commit themselves to that viewpoint.

That Pindar first inserts an episode from the heroic past before acting according to the program he sets out for himself here is yet another example of his concern to manipulate his audience's expectancies (see Introduction, pp. 41-5): the expectancy is raised that we return to the present occasion, but first we get a story about Peleus instead. However, on a more profound level, the Peleus story that is to follow does meet the themes announced. As we will see (and as it is *a priori* to be expected, for that matter), the Peleus story serves the encomiastic purpose of praising the victor; moreover, as will become clear, the implied parallel between Peleus' divine reward and the victory entails an endorsement of the aristocratic, anti-Athenian side.

---

[18] The impersonal perfect δεδόκηται presents the three positive themes for this ode as objectively given: 'it is decided' rather than 'it seems good to me, it is my intention.' The three subject matters do not represent Pindar's own personal choice, but are defined by the occasion.

The transitional passage is rich in images. There is continuity in the imagery used in two respects. First, the poet's refusal to tell about an unbecoming subject is formulated in terms of arrest (cτάcομαι, 16) and his enthusiasm for good subjects in terms of movement.[19] Second, Pindar skips an unsavoury episode from the history of the house of Aeacus and picks up the thread of the story in a different place at a later moment: Peleus' most glorious moment, when he marries a goddess on Mount Pelion in Thessaly in the presence of the gods. The imagery Pindar uses in 19-21 to describe this thematic conduct ties in with the geographical settings of both episodes: not only does the poet 'jump' from one episode to another, he also makes a very long jump from Aegina to Thessaly, thus indeed, like the eagles to which Pindar compares himself in line 21, crossing the sea.

22-37 *Second Episode: Wedding of Peleus and Thetis; Peleus and Hippolyta*

The story about Peleus and Hippolyta, which forms the central narrative tableau of this ode, is one of the most skilfully narrated pieces in Pindar. What is especially admirable is the way in which the poet has integrated the story in the drift of his preceding argument by breaking up the chronological order of the narrated events and using the chronologically last event, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, as the 'frame-story' of the entire episode. The embedded Peleus and Hippolyta story is narrated with a great concern for suspense, while, at the same time, every single detail adds to the point the story wants to make: that Thetis was Peleus' exceptional reward for his in the circumstances exceptionally admirable adherence to the laws of Zeus Xeinios. The reference to Poseidon at the very end of the story does not only emphasize the value of Thetis as a reward, thus contributing to the main theme of the story, it also allows the poet to effect a smooth transition to the following section of the ode. Finally, the poet plays a bold trick by not formally closing off the 'frame-story' of the Muses singing for Peleus: he thus creates the illusion that the section following the myth is still a part of their song; not only does this procedure effect a close integration of the myth with the following section of the poem, it also implicitly involves the complimentary equation of Peleus and the Aeacids with the victor and his family.

The chorus of the Muses sang for the Aeacids, represented by Peleus, on Mount Pelion, on the occasion of the celebration of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. ὡc in 26 introduces the story of Peleus and Hippolyta as the subject matter of the Muses' song. Thus the

story about the Muses singing at Peleus' wedding party is the 'frame-story' of the Peleus and Hippolyta episode which is to follow. The preceding break-off is still central to Pindar's rhetoric. After the poet (on the level of the extemporizing fiction) has inadvertently brought us to the brink of a story unfit to relate and out of place at a festive occasion, and, just in time having checked himself and having recoiled from it, has steered his ode in a different direction, the poet's and audience's main concern is whether the next episode the poet selects will be a fitting story. Embedding the Peleus and Hippolyta story (Pindar's new subject matter) in the frame-story of Peleus' wedding, presenting the new subject as the subject of the Muses' song, serves (on the level of this fictional rhetoric) as a guarantee that this next subject will be an excellent one. The train of thought (14-26) may be summarized as follows: 'I am telling the story of the Aeacids, but now I have encountered an episode unfit to relate, so I am not going to use it, since it is not always profitable wholly to reveal the precise truth and being silent is often the most sensible thing to do. If, on the other hand, I have to praise laudable things, I can leap far and I can cross the sea. This is what I am doing now, skipping a part of the story and picking up the thread in a place across the sea. And this episode I am now going to relate is an excellent subject for my song, for it is a subject the Muses willingly sang about too.' Not only does the embedding frame-story make up for the poet's *faux pas* on the level of his fictional rhetoric, it also, on the level of the poet's real compositional concerns, makes up for Peleus' crime, as marrying a goddess in the presence of the gods signifies that the gods no longer held his crime against him. The idea of his obedience to Zeus' laws making up for his earlier crime is stressed by the fact that he gets a Nereid as his reward, although he murdered a Nereid's son (35/6).[20] The qualification ποντίαν of Thetis in line 36 echoes ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου in line 13.

The chorus of Muses sings to the accompaniment of Apollo's *phorminx*. The Muses begin with an address to Zeus; they then proceed with a song of praise (ὕμνηcαν, 25) about Peleus and Thetis, the newly wedded couple. This 'hymn' includes the episode that Pindar quotes (26-36) about Peleus and Hippolyta; this episode does in fact

[19] Thus Segal, *Hermes* 102, 1974, 397-411.

[20] Thus Mezger, p. 339; G. Méautis, *Pindare le Dorien*, Neuchâtel 1962, 294; Stern, *CPh* 66, 1971, 170; Segal, *Hermes* 102, 1974, 403. Farnell ("The allocation of Thetis as a bride to the mortal Peleus is explained as a divine reward, bestowed by Zeus upon Peleus for his virtue's sake. The murder of Phokos was ignored apparently, for mythology cannot think of too many things at once," I, p. 189) misses the point exactly.

praise Peleus, for it illustrates Peleus' obedience to the laws of Zeus Xeinios in reward for which Zeus gave him Thetis. πρώτιστον μέν (25) characterizes the song about Peleus and Thetis, including the episode about Peleus and Hippolyta, as the first part of the Muses' performance. A corresponding ἔπειτα δέ (or something similar), does not follow. It has been observed that Pindar does not indicate where the Muses' song ends. The closing inverted commas are absent, so to speak. This conveys the suggestion that the remainder of the ode, including the praise of Pytheas and his family, is part of the song of the Muses. By leading the audience to anticipate another part of the Muses' hymn, πρώτιστον μέν helps to convey the suggestion that the song of the Muses does not end at line 41 with the shift from the heroic past to the present occasion. This strategy is in the first place suggestive of the quality of Pindar's ode—a specimen of proud self-consciousness which is relevant in the light of the superiority of poetry over other forms of victory immortalization as thematized in the opening lines, and which contributes to the encomiastic aims of the ode to the extent that the victor's immortalization depends on the quality of the poet's product (cf. *N.*4.6-8, etc.). But the trick of not closing off the song of the Muses contributes also more directly to the encomiastic aims of the ode. By creating the illusion that the Muses are still singing when the victories are mentioned, the Aeginetan chorus performing the present ode merges with the chorus of the Muses: it as singing for Pytheas and his family just as the chorus of the Muses sang for Peleus.[21] This in itself draws a compli-

[21] It is important not to be too literal about this. Surely we cannot believe that the original audience would have found itself wondering whether the Muses sang about Pytheas and Euthymenes on the occasion of Peleus' wedding. Pindar exerts himself to emphasise the parallels between the two festive occasions, the past celebration on Mount Pelion and the present one in Aegina. One of his tricks to do this is πρώτιστον μέν. The audience were supposed to see through this trick but to recognise its intended effect. A comparable strategy has been described by C. Carey for Bacchylides 3: "Only modern printing methods can distinguish whether lines 10-12 are a statement by the poet or a cry by the crowd at Delphi; it is difficult to see how the identity of the speaker could have been brought out in performance. The result is an indeterminacy in the authority for the statement. And for the listener who hears the crowd speaking it is not clear where collective comment ends and authorial comment recommences. In the same way when Bacchylides cites the advice of Apollo later in Ode 3 (78 ff.), it is not clear where the quotation ends. Indeterminacy of speech-boundary is inevitable in narrative performance wherever beginnings and endings are not formally marked. The point here is not the indeterminacy of the point of transition but the specific effect. The poet's views merge with those of the quoted speakers, leaving unclear the point where external authority ends and the poet's authority begins" ('Ethos and Pathos in Bacchylides', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999, p. 20).

mentary analogy between the Aeacids and the victor and his family, and conveys the suggestion that their victories are a reward for their moral behaviour just like Thetis was Peleus' reward for his abiding by the laws of Zeus Xeinios.

The order in which the information, necessary for grasping the narrative setting, is released in 26-34 constitutes a certain suspense: the poet moves from vague descriptions to specific references. Hippolyta's objective is first vaguely described as δόλωι πεδᾶcαι (26). Then, in the next line, this is made slightly more specific: she persuaded her husband with crafty plans to be her accomplice. Line 29 reveals that these crafty plans involved making up a false story, the content of which is given in 30/1. In 31-4 we finally get the true state of affairs (first simply said to be 'the other way around,' then specified), which enables us to get a complete picture of the situation and an idea about what Hippolyta's motif was in the first place. The tendency for the poet to move from vague to specific is also discernible on a smaller scale, in the way he introduces Acastus as a story participant: first he is circumscribed as the Μαγνήτων cκοπόc (27), then more specifically as Hippolyta's husband (ἀκοίταν, 28); finally he is mentioned by name in line 30.

It is clear that the central theme of the Peleus and Hippolyta episode is that Thetis was Peleus' exceptional reward for his adherence to the laws of Zeus Xeinios.[22] Pindar emphasizes that it was quite tempting for Peleus to yield to Hippolyta's advances: his moral stability is all the more to be admired. ἁβρά in 26 stresses Hippolyta's physical attractiveness. The verbal sophistication she uses to get her husband on her side (27-9) gives us an idea of the dexterity with which she came on to Peleus 'with all her heart, very hard trying to seduce him' (31/2). Both πολλά and παντὶ θυμῶι emphasize the intensity and wholeheartedness of Hippolyta's vamping. She did everything she could: Peleus is all the more to be admired for not giving in to her advances. Peleus' reaction to her advances, 'her steep words stimulated his feeling' (32), is quite ambiguous as it stands. In the context about Hippolyta's attempts to seduce Peleus it

---

[22] Thus Bury (pp. 82, 86), Farnell ("this moral myth does not so much exemplify the sanctity of our seventh commandment for the earlier Greeks as their conscience concerning the law of hospitality," I, p. 189), Stern (*CPh* 66, 1971, 171/2). Dissen interprets the myth as a warning to both sons of Lampon not to desert from "castitas" and "pudicitia" ("nempe pueris iuvenibusque in robore virium nihil aptius commendaveris quam cωφροcύνην, praesertim quum amoris tempora instent," p. 411). Similarly, Rauchenstein, 'Zu Pindars Nemeen', *Philologus* 13, 1858, 258-261, takes the myth to recommend "keuschheit und heilighaltung der ehe" (p. 258); thus also Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, pp. 171, 174.

could mean two things: either 'her steep words roused his anger' or 'her steep words stimulated his lust.'[23] The former interpretation is commonly adopted,[24] but the Greek as it stands lends itself perfectly well to the latter: the interpretation 'her steep words roused his anger and immediately he scorned her out of fear for Zeus' anger' is just as plausible as 'her steep words stimulated his lust, but immediately he repulsed her out of fear for Zeus' anger.' Whatever the primary effect of her words was, he immediately rejected her, out of fear for Zeus' wrath.[25] This polyinterpretability is no doubt intended. The veiled allusion to Peleus' lust for Hippolyta adds to the picture that she was a very attractive woman. This is meant to increase our admiration for Peleus: it is easy to respect divine laws when violating them means giving in to an unattractive woman; but this was a horse of a different colour.

Peleus rejected Hippolyta 'out of fear for the anger of Zeus Xeinios.' If Peleus had given in to Hippolyta's advances he would have violated the mutual agreements between guest and host, guarded by Ζεὺϲ Ξείνιοϲ, as he would have done harm to his host Acastus, by whom he had been purified. Zeus 'took good notice' of Peleus' respect for his laws and granted him Thetis as a reward for that. According to the traditional story, told by Pindar in *I.*8, Thetis was given to Peleus because of certain inconvenient, sensitive issues in Olympian politics. On the advice of Themis, Zeus chose Peleus to be the husband of the Nereid Thetis, although Zeus himself was not completely insensitive to her charms and would have liked to enjoy her company himself, and the same was true for Poseidon (*I.*8.30-2;

---

[23] 'Her steep words roused his anger': (Jason speaks to Pelias:) ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένεϲ ὠκύτεραι | κέρδοϲ αἰνῆϲαι πρὸ δίκαϲ δόλιον τραχεῖαν ἑρπόντων πρὸϲ ἔπιβδαν ὅμωϲ· | ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρὴ καὶ ϲὲ θεμιϲϲαμένουϲ ὀργὰϲ ὑφαίνειν λοιπὸν ὄλβον, *P.*4.139-41; πότερόν νιν (*sc.* Clytaemnestra) ἄρ' Ἰφιγένει' ... | ἔκνιξεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρϲαι χόλον, *P.*11.22/3. 'Her steep words stimulated his lust': καὶ ἔν τε θεοῖϲ τοῦτο κἀνθρώποιϲ ὁμῶϲ | αἰδέοντ' ἀμφαδὸν ἁδείαϲ τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶϲ. | καὶ γὰρ ϲέ, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψευδεῖ θιγεῖν, | ἔτραπε μείλιχοϲ ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον, *P.*9.40-3; καὶ γὰρ | ἑτέροιϲ ἑτέρων ἔρωτεϲ ἔκνιξαν φρέναϲ, *P.*10.59/60, cf. τὸν δὲ Ἀρίϲτωνα ἔκνιξε ἄρα τῆϲ γυναικὸϲ ταύτηϲ ἔρωϲ, Hdt.6.62; εἴ ϲε μὴ κνίζοι λέχοϲ, E.*Med.*568.

[24] E.g. 'her steep words stung him to anger', Bowra, *The Odes of Pindar* (transl.), p.39; 'But his mood was stung by her sheer words, and forthwith he repelled the bride', Bury *ad loc.*; 'Her bold language stung him to wrath', Sandys. The only scholar known to me who recognizes this polyinterpretability is Jacob Stern, 'The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5', *CPh* 66, 1971, 171/2.

[25] δέ in line 33 leaves implicit whether Peleus' rejection of Hippolyta was a consequence of his primary reaction to or in antithesis with it, thus maintaining the ambiguity (see Introduction, pp. 26-30). νύμφα (33) is a well-chosen word: it combines its denotation 'bride, married woman,' i.e., the reason why Hippolyta's behaviour is unacceptable, with connotations of physical attractiveness (a νύμφα is a young woman), which is the reason why her behaviour was dangerous for Peleus.

Apollod.3.13.5). They were, however, discouraged by a prophecy that a son born to Thetis would become more powerful than his father. Moreover, Thetis had proved herself unwilling to yield to Zeus' advances: it would serve her well to be compelled to marry a mortal.[26] There is no hint whatsoever to Zeus' practical motifs for giving Thetis away to Peleus in Pindar's account of the story. The prophecy is not mentioned. Here Pindar presents Thetis as Peleus' very special reward for respecting the laws of Zeus Xeinios. Mentioning the prophecy would detract from the value of this reward. The rivalry between Zeus and Poseidon for Thetis' favours is alluded to (37), for this emphasizes Peleus' very special privilege.[27]

The reference to Hippolyta's lies recalls the gnomic statement about truth in 16/7. In fact, the description of Hippolyta's behaviour exactly inverts the elements of the *gnomae*. ἀλάθεια is portrayed there as a virtuous matron who covers her face out of αἰδώϲ; Hippolyta's conduct is shameless, she uses δόλοϲ and crafty plans. In the gnomic context κέρδοϲ is won if truth is silent; Hippolyta wins κέρδοϲ (i.e., accomplishes her objective) through sophisticated lies. The *gnome* stresses the inefficacy of truth in certain circumstances; Hippolyta's lies are successful. We are presented two alternative ways of winning κέρδοϲ by not telling the truth: tactful reticence and slanderous lies.

Hubbard (*Pindaric Mind*, pp. 105/6) observed that Pindar's description of Hippolyta's cunning emphasizes her verbal sophistication. ϲυνέπαξε, together with the fact that her λόγοϲ is qualified as ποιητόϲ (29),[28] associates her feigned story with poetry, or at least with carefully constructed, made up stories. ποικίλοιϲ in line 28 seems designed to evoke associations with poetry: the same adjective is used in line 42 to qualify victory odes.[29] That Hippolyta's lies recall the gnome about truth reinforces this association, for the gnome bears directly on poetical procedures. What are we to make of all this? The emphasis on Hippolyta's verbal sophistication is functional, as we observed, in that it increases our admiration for Peleus' not falling for her; associating Hippolyta's verbal sophistication with the powers of poetry strengthens this point.

But there is more to it. The Muses sing a true song about lies within the framework of a song that is selective with the truth; and

---

[26] Τινὲϲ δὲ λέγουϲι Θέτιν μὴ βουληθῆναι Διὶ ϲυνελθεῖν ὡϲ ὑπὸ Ἥραϲ τραφεῖϲαν, Διὰ δὲ ὀργιϲθέντα θνητῶι θέλειν αὐτὴν ϲυνοικίϲαι, Apollod.3.13.5; cf. A.R.4.790-8.

[27] The weighty amount of titles given to Zeus in 34/5 (ὀρϲινεφήϲ ... | Ζεὺϲ ἀθανάτων βαϲιλεύϲ, together with ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) adds to the value of the reward too.

[28] Cf. Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 106 n. 104.

[29] See also Walsh, *Varieties of Enchantment*, pp. 41/2.

the lies are like song in their verbal sophistication. Thus we have the whole scale: truth, tactful reticence that hides the truth from view but does not violate it, and malicious falsehood. And these are all connected with praise and blame: the Muses' true song is a song of praise for Peleus, like Pindar's selectively true song praises the victor; Hippolyta's lies slander Peleus. The way in which slanderous lies are embedded in a true song of praise which is in turn embedded in Pindar's own song of praise being 'economical with the actuality' is in itself a poetical *tour de force.* The drift of Pindar's fictional argument, presenting the frame story of the Muses' song as a guarantee for the propriety of the Peleus and Hippolyta episode as a subject for the present ode after the poet has inadvertently brought us to the brink of a disreputable story, adds an additional layer of paradoxical complexity. Put in the terms of the nexus of truth and lies and of praise and blame, what this fictional strategy boils down to is that a story of blame about Peleus is hidden from view without violating the truth about it; that it is made up for by a story in which Hippolyta slanders Peleus with malicious lies; and that the fittingness of this story is stressed by making it the subject of the Muses' true song of praise for Peleus. On top of all this, the song of praise of the chorus of the Muses is not formally closed off, so that it merges with the song of praise for the victor of Pindar's chorus. This kind of verbal complexity—which, as far as I am aware, is not supposed to occur in Greek poetry before the Hellenistic era—heightens the audience's intellectual appreciation for the poet's art. In effect, we get a startling demonstration of the devious ways of poetry and of Pindar's own verbal sophistication. The power of poetry to manipulate truth, described in passages like *O.*1.28-32 and elsewhere, is employed here in order to create a *leçon par l'example* of this very principle. This is suggestive of the quality of Pindar's ode, which is relevant in the light of the superiority of poetry over other forms of victory immortalization as thematized in the opening lines, and which contributes to the encomiastic aims of the ode to the extent that the victors immortalization depends on the quality of the poet's product (cf. *N.*4.6-8, etc.).

37-41 *Epilogue: Poseidon at the Isthmian Games*

The relative pronoun in 37 introduces the reference to Poseidon's voyages to the Isthmus as a casual association, inadvertently evoked by the preceding reference to the god. This is an example of the fictional imitation of spontaneous text production (see Introduction, pp. 34-7). On the level of the poet's real compositional concerns, the

reference to Poseidon has been carefully placed at the very end of the narrative in order to allow a smooth transition back to athletics, i.e., to his encomiastic program in its narrowest sense, via a brief description of athletic competition on the Isthmus.[30]

The association of Poseidon with athletics has a deeper significance. In the first triad the idea of Aegina's fame spreading far and wide is closely connected with the Aeginetan ships sailing the seas of the world. Line 9 juxtaposes Aegina's 'excellent men,' of whom the victor Pytheas is an example, and its naval supremacy. In line 4 Pytheas is implicitly associated with Poseidon by means of εὐρυcθενής, which is a fixed epithet for Poseidon in Homer. Here the god of the seas is in turn associated with athletics. In line 51 below we have imagery derived from sailing in a passage dealing with Themistius' victories. The association of athletics with seamanship is a recurring theme in this ode.

Lines 38/9 describe two consecutive stages of the Isthmian Games: line 38 describes the welcoming (δέκονται) of the patron deity, Poseidon, on the opening day of the festival, a ceremony that included a sacrifice to the god[31]; 'and they compete with the bold strength of their limbs' (39) is a brief description of athletic competition in general, although the combination of strength and courage pre-eminently evokes associations with combat sports, the disciplines in which the present victor and his family specialized. The εὔφρονες ἶλαι are the athletes (or possibly the athletes and spectators together) taking part in the opening ceremony, for they must also be the subject of ἐρίζοντι in the next line. The contestants' εὐφρονία during this opening ceremony contrasts their grimmer state of mind during the competition (cf. θραcεῖ). Pindar is keen on exploiting contrasts between the fierce mood of the actual competition and the exalted and festive mood of the victory celebration (cf. *P.*8.81-92, where it is combined with a contrast between the victor and the defeated contestants; see also Introduction, pp. 45-7). Here we have a different but similar contrast between the festive mood of the collectively celebrated opening day and the grim rivalry of competition. This can be interpreted as an echo of lines 9-16 above, where the solidarity of

---

[30] Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 295, argues for a more specific relevance of the Poseidon passage in the light of what follows. He suggests that the two victories of Euthymenes mentioned in 41/2 are Isthmian victories. But this does not go with Αἰγίναθε. For more details see my note *ad loc.*

[31] That such a sacrifice took place may be inferred from οἱ φυγάδες τῶν Κορινθίων ἐποίηcαν τῶι Ποcειδῶνι τὴν θυcίαν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα, X.*HG* 4.5.2; cf. also Philostr.*Im.*2.16.

the three sons of Aeacus during their sacrifice to Zeus (9-11) contrasts the grim mood of fratricide (14-6).

'Inborn (inherited) destiny decides over everything'. This *gnome* follows the account of Poseidon attending to the Isthmian Games, and it applies in the first place to the role of inborn destiny in the Games as the crucial factor that makes the difference between victory and defeat.[32] The scope of the statement is, however, wider, as is made explicit by πάντων. It is presented as a principle that applies to life in general. The power of inherited excellence is without doubt one of the most frequently formulated themes in Pindar's victory odes. Unlike Bacchylides (who does not address the theme once in the extent fragments), Pindar places himself squarely in aristocratic traditions. Thematically, the *gnome* forms an excellent introduction to the final section of this ode. The victories of Pytheas, Euthymenes and Themistius are illustrative of the power of inherited excellence.

The *gnome* has much poignancy in the light of the historical setting of the performance of the ode and Pindar's rhetorical aim of winning back the δῆμος for the aristocratic Aeginetan cause. In itself the *gnome* entails a justification of the very principles of the aristocracy. Apart from that it introduces the victories of the various members of the same family, the gnome helps to connect the victor and his family with the Aeacids. They have the same πότμος as the Aeacids, for the πότμος goes with their γένος. More specifically, the gnome presents the path from crime to divine reward as a destiny inherent to their race, thus helping to draw the parallel between the victories of the family and Peleus' bride. Thus the gnome may even be understood as an excuse for the crimes committed by the aristocracy in the recent past: this was due to their πότμος cυγγενής as displayed already by Peleus.

Closure

With the address to Euthymenes in line 41 the poet returns to the present occasion and his encomiastic duty in its narrowest sense, which is to praise the victor and his family. However, as we observed, there is no signal indicating that the song of the Muses, which started with ὡς in 26, ends here. This conveys the suggestion that the remainder of the ode, including the praise of Pytheas and

---

[32] For κρίνω referring to deciding a contest (to fit the narrower application of the *gnome*) cf. τοῖς οὔτε νόςτος ὁμῶς | ἐπαλπνος ἐν Πυθιάδι κρίθη, *P.*8.83/4 with my note (pp. 584/5).

his family, is part of the song of the Muses. By leading the audience to anticipate another part of the Muses' hymn, πρώτιστον μέν in 25 helps to convey the suggestion that the song of the Muses does not end here with the shift from the heroic past to the present occasion.

Euthymenes, Pytheas' maternal uncle is said to have won two victories at local Aeginetan games[33]: he 'fell in the arms of Victory.' As Bury (p. 94) observed, a parallel is drawn between Peleus, who received a goddess as a reward for his respect for Zeus Xeinios, and Euthymenes, who received the goddess Nike as a reward. ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων (42) has erotic connotations[34]; here it recalls the picture of Peleus getting Thetis as his wife. Furthermore, Euthymenes' 'marriage' to Nike is celebrated with hymns (42); the Muses sing hymns for Peleus and Thetis on their wedding (22-6). The parallel is in itself of course highly complimentary. But there may be more to it: it conveys the suggestion that Euthymenes' victories are a reward; more specifically, the suggestion is that his victories are his reward for abiding by the good old Aeginetan aristocratic principles, like Peleus got Thetis in reward for his respecting ξενία.[35]

Peleus is pardoned by the gods for his crime. Zeus himself gives him one of the greatest rewards to be imagined, marrying a goddess. He celebrates his wedding in the presence of the gods. Pindar's presentation centres on explicitly characterizing Thetis as Peleus' very special reward for his abiding by the laws of ξενία. ξενία is an aristocratic Aeginetan principle *par excellence.* Thus Peleus is forgiven his earlier crime by the gods because he stuck to the good old Aeginetan values: the suggestion is that similarly the Aeginetan rulers, including the victor and his family, are pardoned for their crimes committed towards the δῆμος because they uphold the old Aeginetan values. This parallel is made explicit by drawing an analogy between Peleus' hierogamy and Euthymenes' 'falling in the arms of Victory.' The victory is thus presented as a divine reward. This is meant to prove that the divine world no longer holds the crimes of the family against it and that the gods are now (again) on the aristocratic side. The trick of not formally closing off the song of the Muses results in

---

[33] Later he was to win some major victories, mentioned in *I.*6 for Pytheas' younger brother Phylacidas. See my note and *CQ* 45, 1995, 319-23.

[34] As it is suggested by Silk, *Interaction*, 154. See comm. *ad loc.*

[35] Cf. Figueira, *Aegina*, p. 328: "the invocations of Aegina, in which are included references to Aeginetan *xenia*, are connected with the notion of the victor's return to his home and his bringing of honor to his mother city (*O.*8.20, *N.*4.11-3, *N.*3.1/2, *h.l.* lines 7/8). This suggests that the victorious athlete, or rather the socio-political group of which he was a part, assimilated the honor of victory to the reputation gained through rectitude towards strangers."

a merging of the chorus praising Peleus on the occasion of the celebration of his divine reward with the chorus of Aeginetans praising the victor and his family on the occasion of the celebration of their victories and underscores the parallel. Thus Pindar not only provides a frame-work in which the reconciliation of the δῆμος with the aristocratic classes becomes possible: by presenting the victories as proof of divine favour he aims at presenting this reconciliation as nothing less than inevitable.

In line 43 the victor himself is addressed: 'Having rushed after you, Pytheas, now also your uncle does honour to that hero's (i.e., Peleus') kindred race (i.e., the Aeginetans).' Apparently, one of Euthymenes' two Aeginetan victories mentioned in the preceding lines was posterior to Pytheas' Nemean victory.[36] Thus it can be said that paradoxically[37] Euthymenes, the uncle, has followed after Pytheas, the younger cousin. καὶ νῦν emphatically characterizes Euthymenes' honouring his race as something that has happened only recently. The unusual circumstance helps to explain why, contrary to Pindar's usual practice, Euthymenes' victories are mentioned before the praise of the victor himself: the exceptional circumstance that, in the period between Pytheas' victory and the celebrations, the victor's uncle had won a victory in local Aeginetan games calls for a special treatment. This line contains a concrete example of the principle expressed in the *gnome* in 40/1: the successes run in the family; moreover, as κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος characterizes the Aeginetans as kindred to Peleus, the victories of the uncle and cousin are presented as a manifestation of the qualities displayed by the Aeacids. Presenting the Aeginetans as Peleus' kindred race aims at underscoring what unifies the nation as a whole, *viz.* a common ancestry, and is thus functional in the light of Pindar's aim to win back the δῆμος for the aristocratic Aeginetan cause.

In 44-6 we turn to Pytheas' earlier victories. Line 44, 'Nemea is firmly fixed, and so is the local month which Apollo loves,' underscores the fame and importance of the Nemean and Delphinian Games, where Pytheas had won. His victory in Aegina is mentioned

---

[36] Thus P. Maas, 'Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar', *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* 39, 1913, 316/7. Cf. Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 291. It cannot be excluded entirely that *both* Euthymenes' Aeginetan victories were won in the period between Pytheas' victory and the current celebration, but then we would have to assume that Euthymenes' victories were won in two different disciplines; one would expect Pindar to mention such an unusual detail (cf. line 52 below).

[37] The value of ἤτοι is to draw attention to a paradoxical circumstance. See my note.

in line 45: 'At home he conquered all of his own age who came' is a poetic but unambiguous way of saying that Pytheas had won an unspecified number of victories in local Aeginetan games (*viz.* the Delphinian Games) in his own age-category. Pytheas had also won in Megara, as line 46 adds.

The enumeration of Pytheas' and his uncle's victories, illustrative of the competitive spirit of the family, leads over into a statement about the martial spirit of the *polis* as a whole[38]: 'I am glad that the whole city fights for noble things' (46/7). This ode was performed during[39] a war between Aegina and Athens. The statement is to be understood as a declaration of Pindar's solidarity and sympathy with Aegina, defending its own cause in concord against its big enemy. The poet's declaration of solidarity with the *whole* πόλις fighting for noble things is tendentious. ἐςλά has aristocratic connotations. What is said as a factual observation, ἐςλοῖςι μάρναται πέρι πᾶςα πόλις, is in fact exactly the desired state of affairs: the whole city, including the δῆμος, in concord defending the Aeginetan (i.e., aristocratic) cause against the formidable arch-enemy Athens.

The placement of the utterance in between the victory catalogue and the trainer passage is clever. Thus the successes of an aristocratic Aeginetan family in the combat sports are by juxtaposition implicitly connected with the warlike spirit of Aegina as a whole: since the victories of the family are explicitly presented as a manifestation of the prowess of the Aeacids which characterizes Aegina as a whole (cf. κείνου ὁμόςπορον ἔθνος, 43), they can be regarded as a favourable token for the outcome of the war. By making perfectly clear where he stands in the conflict, Pindar creates the right mood for the passage in which he has to give credit to the victor's Athenian trainer.

The passage devoted to Menander is short by comparison with other trainer-passages.[40] Moreover, 'it is necessary that the architect of athletes comes from Athens,' is a surprising way of praising him.

---

38 Here μάρναται is generally taken in a metaphorical sense, 'I rejoice that the whole city joins in the conflict for noble prizes.' Apart from the fact that this is a bold exaggeration, an objection against this interpretation is that the idea of a city contending at the games is unparalleled in Pindar. The contestants are invariably presented as individuals (who, of course, do honour to their cities when they are successful) and Pindar nowhere says that a city as a whole takes part in the games. The fact that πᾶςα πόλις is the subject of μάρναται is strongly in favour of a literal interpretation of the verb. For more details see my note *ad loc.* and *CQ* 45, 1995, 325/6.

39 That this ode, *pace* Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 170), was performed *during* the war can be deduced from the present tense μάρναται in line 47.

40 *N.*4.93-6, *I.*4.71b-72b, *I.*5.59-61, *O.*8.54-66, *O.*10.16-21. Only *N.*6.64-6 is shorter.

Nothing is said about his specific qualities[41] and his Athenian origin can hardly be regarded as a personal merit. Because χρή is used, instead of just ἐςτί or the like, this statement gives the impression that Menander's Athenian origin is regarded as an unfortunate coincidence; it almost sounds like an excuse.[42]

After briefly dealing with the victor's Athenian trainer Menander in 48-9, Pindar turns to Themistius, the victor's maternal grandfather: 'But if you come to sing of Themistius, shrink no longer. Give your voice' (50-1). By means of μηκέτι ῥίγει in line 50, 'shrink no longer,' Pindar explicitly characterizes his treatment of the Athenian trainer Menander in 48-9, in retrospect, as cold; there he did 'shrink back.'[43] That Pindar did perform the action of ῥιγεῖν before is implied by ἔτι and by the use of the *present* imperative.[44] It is, of course, extremely harsh that Pindar says that he was shrinking back when he had to mention Menander.[45] This is almost the same as saying that he was unwilling to praise him. Such a refusal to praise whom praise is due is unacceptable on the part of an epinician poet, unless it gives voice to the opinions of his commissioner and his audience. Motifs of personal dislike are out of the question. There must have been a general Aeginetan antipathy against Menander and the reason must have been that he was an Athenian. The trainer passage itself (48-9) justifies the assumption that Menander is only mentioned by virtue of epinician conventions, notwithstanding a general Aeginetan antipathy against his Athenian origin. Pindar's extremely harsh treatment of the Athenian trainer in this ode would have been unthinkable in the context of just the usual feud between Aegina and Athens.[46] As this ode was performed during a fierce all-out war between Aegina and

---

[41] In the other passages trainers are praised for their physical qualities (*N*.6.64/5, *I*.5.61), their mental or moral qualities (*I*.5.61, implied in *N*.4.95/6; perhaps also implied in *I*.4.72a), their specific qualities as a trainer (*O*.8.59-64, *I*.5.59/60, *N*.6.66, *I*.4.71b/72a, *O*.10.20/1; perhaps also *N*.4.96), and their previous successes (*O*.8.56-9, 65/6).

[42] Contrast the explicit praise in the other passages, esp. κωμάξομαι τερπνὰν ἐπιςτάζων χάριν, *I*.4.72b; αἰνέων, *N*.4.93; αἰνέω, *I*.5.59; κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνωι, *O*.8.54; ἐρέω ταύταν χάριν, *O*.8.57; φερέτω χάριν, *O*.10.17.

[43] Thus also Wilamowitz, p. 170. Bury (p. 97) also interprets μηκέτι ῥίγει correctly ('"Be reserved no longer" implies that there were reasons for reserve in reference to somebody else.'), but he does not draw the obvious conclusion that this applies to the preceding section of the poem, where Menander is mentioned.

[44] See, e.g., C.M.J. Sicking, 'The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms, Especially in the Imperative', *Glotta* 69 (1991), 14-43 and 154-170, esp. p. 157 with his examples 78-80, pp. 160-1.

[45] Cf. Severyns, pp. 47-8, n. 30.

[46] For the maritime rivalry between Athens and Aegina see my *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156/7. Further references are to be found there.

Athens, it is not surprising that Menander's Athenian origin was regarded as an unfortunate coincidence.

We must not make the mistake of regarding Pindar's harsh treatment of the trainer as the inevitable result of a clash between the epinician conventions and the sympathies of the audience. That the epinician conventions also allowed for a different solution appears from Bacchylides' treatment of Menander in his ode for the same occasion (13). Unlike Pindar Bacchylides does praise Menander's accomplishments unreservedly (13.190-8). In a gnomic passage directly following the praise of Menander (199-209), Bacchylides defends the very fact that he has praised him.[47] He does so in general terms, appealing to his impartial *ethos* of Panhellenic[48] epinician poet, and presenting general principles as δίκα and ἀλάθεια as compelling him to contribute due praise to everyone who deserves it and as surpassing momentary conflicts between two *poleis*.[49] Pindar's treatment of Menander in a way that stirs up his audience's anti-Athenian sentiments reflects a conscious strategy. Pindar's striking way of dealing with the Athenian trainer Menander fits in his strategy which aims at winning back the δῆμος for the aristocratic, truly Aeginetan cause. Nothing has a more unifying effect than a common enemy. The harsh treatment of the Athenian trainer reminds the audience of Athens as their common enemy.

In line 51 Pindar expresses his enthusiasm for Themistius through nautical imagery: 'Stretch the sails up to the cross-piece of the mast-top'. The context is about Themistius being an excellent subject for Pindar's song of praise. The suggestion of the image is that Themistius resembles fair wind, so to speak, to which the poet can let out his sails, in order to let his song, like a ship, proceed without the danger of crashing.[50] The contrast with Menander is implied. The nautical imagery recalls line 2 of this ode. The echo as such has

[47] F.G. Kenyon, *Bacchylides* (Oxford, 1898), too, interprets this passage as an apology for praising an Athenian. See also M. Woloch, 'Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides', *CW* 56 (1963), 102-4 and 121. On p. 103 Woloch argues that Bacchylides does not praise Menander willingly. Surprisingly, he takes Pindar as being unequivocally complimentary with respect to Menander.

[48] Bacchylides emphasizes the Panhellenic character of the festivals in 198, in connection with Menander.

[49] For more details see my 'The Date of Pindar's Fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' Thirteenth Ode', *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-332, esp. 326-8.

[50] Some critics (Fraccaroli, p. 144; Cerrato, p. 420; Péron, *Images maritimes*, p. 50) supposed that the image of the sails is prompted by Themistius' name (Θεμ-ίcτιον ~ ἱcτία). Apart from that neither the etymology nor the accentuation of Themistius' name really activates this association, such an association, if it existed, would never *explain* an image.

a certain aesthetic appeal, and—in the fashion of circular composition—adds to the impression that the ode is going to be rounded off. Pindar urges himself to record that Themistius won a double victory in Epidaurus, *viz.* both in boxing and in the pancration, and that he had the honour to dedicate Pytheas' victory crown in the shrine of Aeacus. In *I*.6.65 Pytheas, Phylacidas (Pytheas' younger brother) and Euthymenes are said to be members of the οἶκος of Themistius. His prominent position within the family of the victor explains why it was his privilege to dedicate the victor's crown. He probably did so in the context of the performance of this ode, for that seems to be the implication of his collaboration with the Graces (54).

Pindar effects a contrast between Menander and Themistius. Themistius is the grand old man of the victor's influential family and head of the οἶκος. His status is emphasized as Pindar records that he had the honour to dedicate the victor's crown. That he dedicates it to the temple of Aeacus, the arch-father of the Aeginetans, characterizes him as a true Aeginetan. The nautical imagery used in the passage that praises him recalls the opening lines of the ode and associates Themistius with Aegina's naval power. Thus we can see that Pindar subtly portrays Themistius, without doubt one of the most influential aristocrats on the island, as a true Aeginetan. The contrast with Menander is rhetorically very effective: the common enemy Athens is contrasted with a truly Aeginetan attitude and this desirable attitude is connected with a prominent member of the παχέες. The δῆμος is meant to arrive at the conclusion that it should obey the Aeginetan rulers again.

The Relevance of the Historical Setting

Summary

The references to the war between Aegina and Athens in lines 19, 46/7, and the hostile treatment of the Athenian trainer in 48-50 prove that Pindar gives the contemporary events a place in this ode. The ode as a whole gains in clarity considerably if it is recognized that it was performed in a situation in which, on the one hand, Aegina had to face the threat of an Athenian invasion while, on the other, there was more than the usual internal tension between the aristocratic rulers and the δῆμος due to the recent outbursts of violence. Then it becomes clear that Pindar does not so much weave in one or two sections, loosely connected with the encomiastic purpose of the ode, in which he declares his soli-

darity with his favourite Aegina fighting a war against its arch-enemy: the ode as a whole is designed to endorse and propagate the aristocratic side to which his commissioners belong and the athletic victory is given a special significance in the light of this rhetorical purpose.

Pindar's rhetoric aims at effecting the internal Aeginetan concord that is indispensable in the light of the formidable threat of Athens preparing itself with all its might to take over the island. The mistrust of the δῆμοϲ for the παχέεϲ must have been tremendous. The recent slaughtering of seven hundred members of the δῆμοϲ by the aristocrat rulers was fresh in the audience's memories. Restoring concord in Aegina depends on reconciling the δῆμοϲ with the aristocratic rulers. So, more specifically, Pindar's aim is to win the δῆμοϲ back for the aristocratic Aeginetan cause. The aim cannot easily be accomplished without first acknowledging the crime committed. This is the function of the story of Peleus' and Telamon's murder of their half-brother. Given the circumstances, this story about Aeginetan brother murder is an all but overt allusion to these recent outbursts of violence, when Aeginetans killed fellow Aeginetans. Explicitly characterizing the brother-murder, and thus indirectly the violence committed by the aristocratic rulers in the recent past, as μὴ ἐν δίκαι serves as a gesture of compromise and compensation towards the members of the δῆμοϲ present in the audience. Contrasting this breach of solidarity with the picture of all the Aeacids praying in concord for Aegina's prosperity, a prayer that has been fulfilled as Pindar suggests, has the function of promoting internal solidarity in Aegina.

Peleus is pardoned for his crime by the gods. Zeus himself gives him one of the greatest rewards to be imagined: marriage to a goddess. Pindar's presentation centres on explicitly characterizing Thetis as Peleus' very special reward for his abiding by the laws of ξενία. ξενία is *par excellence* an Aeginetan principle. Thus Peleus is forgiven his earlier crime by the gods because he stuck to the good old Aeginetan values: the suggestion is that similarly the Aeginetan rulers, including the victor and his family, are pardoned for their crimes committed towards the δῆμοϲ because they uphold the old Aeginetan values. This parallel is made explicit by drawing an analogy between Peleus' hierogamy and Euthymenes' 'falling in the arms of Victory.' The victory is thus presented as a divine reward and as positive proof that the gods have pardoned earlier crimes and are now (again) on the aristocratic side. The trick of not formally closing off the song of the Muses results in a merging of the chorus praising Peleus on the occasion of the celebration of his divine re-

ward with the chorus of Aeginetans praising the victor and his family on the occasion of the celebration of their victories and underscores the parallel. By presenting the victories as proof of divine favour Pindar provides a frame-work in which the reconciliation of the δῆμος with the aristocratic class becomes possible, or even inevitable.[51]

The emphasis on the power of inherited excellence (40/1) entails a justification of the very principles of the aristocracy. Furthermore, the *gnome* helps to connect the victor and his family with the Aeacids: they have the same πότμος. More specifically, the *gnome* presents the path from crime to divine reward as a destiny inherent to their race, thus helping to draw the parallel between the victories of the family and Peleus' bride. Thus the *gnome* may even be understood as an excuse for the crimes committed by the aristocracy in the recent past: this was due to their πότμος συγγενής as displayed already by Peleus.

Presenting the Aeginetans as Peleus' kindred race (κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, 43) stresses the common ancestry as a unifying factor for the nation as a whole. The poet's declaration of solidarity with the *whole* πόλις fighting for noble things in 46/7 is tendentious. ἐσλά has aristocratic connotations. What is said as a factual observation, ἐσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις, is in fact exactly the desired state of affairs: the whole city, including the δῆμος, defending in concord the Aeginetan (i.e., aristocratic) cause against the big enemy Athens. The harsh treatment of the Athenian trainer reminds the audience of Athens as their common enemy. The contrast between Menander and Themistius is highly effective: the common enemy Athens is contrasted with a truly Aeginetan attitude and this desirable attitude is connected with no doubt one of the most prominent members of the aristocratic ruling class.

The Theme of Exile; Truth and Lies

Pindar explicitly says Peleus and Telamon were exiled from Aegina after their crime (15/6). Peleus' adventures with Hippolyta happened when he was in exile. It seems implausible to take the parallel that is drawn between Peleus and Euthymenes so far as to conclude that Euthymenes was an exile or that he was among those

---

[51] The strictly speaking illogical plural κείνοις in line 22 (referring to the Aeacids of whom only Peleus is present) may be designed to present Peleus' recompense as a compensation for the Aeacids and thus to convey the suggestion that the victories of Euthymenes and Pytheas are proof of divine favour for the aristocratic rulers as a group in its entirety.

Aeginetan aristocrats who took Nicodromus' side and fled to Sounion. It is unlikely that one member of the influential family would chose the side of the δῆμος; if he did it is unlikely that he would get a favourable treatment in a public performance in Aegina. If the entire family had been on the side of the δῆμος it is very unlikely that they would have been allowed a public celebration in Aegina at all. Apparently there is no absolute one to one correspondence between the characters of the myth and the persons in reality. However, the prominence of the theme of exile may be understood as commenting (albeit in an implicit and poetical way) upon the behaviour of the Aeginetan exile in Athens who conspired with Athens against his old home-land: Nicodromus. In other words, the explicit reference to the exile of Peleus and Telamon may be designed to evoke associations with Nicodromus. Peleus' abiding by the old Aeginetan principle of ξενία serves as a compelling contrast with the behaviour of the exile Nicodromus in Athens who did quite the contrary of sticking to Aeginetan principles. Thus, in connection with the rhetoric aim of winning the δῆμος back for the aristocratic Aeginetan cause, there may be an element of implicit moral disqualification of Nicodromus in this ode: a disqualification by contrast. Again, Peleus does not 'stand for' Nicodromus; there is no exact correspondence. But Peleus' attitude forms a positive counter-example to the negative reality represented by Nicodromus.

Does this also give a deeper significance to Hippolyta's cunning lies? I believe it does. If we interpret Peleus as he is portrayed in this ode as representing the aristocratic, truly Aeginetan spirit, and if we interpret his behaviour in exile to contrast Nicodromus' behaviour in Athens, it is tempting to conclude that the suggestion conveyed is that Nicodromus and his followers, unlike Peleus, did fall for an alluring perspective that advertized itself with great sophistication. The implicit comparison of falling victim to the attractions of a pro-Athenian attitude with yielding to an attractive woman vamping with everything she has got and doing so with great dexterity is rhetorically effective in that it reaches out to the pro-Athenians with an explanation of their mistake: there can be no doubt their behaviour is un-Aeginetan and wrong, but it is understandable in a way. Pindar does not want to polarize but to reconcile. If the aim is to win those present in the audience still fostering warm feeling for Athens back for the truly Aeginetan, aristocratic side, this aim is more easily accomplished by presenting them as victims of clever manipulation than by *tout court* condemning their attitude.

Truth, tactful reticence that hides the truth from view but does

not violate it, and sophisticated lies: Pindar explores the whole scale in this ode. The recent past is painful, but must be put aside. The truth must be acknowledged but κέρδοc is won if truth is silent. Pindar's fictional break-off rhetoric is more than a clever trick: the way he handles the ugly story from the heroic past about Peleus and Telamon murdering Phocus is exemplary for how both factions in his audience should deal with the painful events in the recent past if Aegina wants to survive as an independent state. But above all there is one truth that cannot be missed, because it happens before the audience's eyes: the gods have given Pytheas a victory and a chorus representing Aegina as a whole celebrates this token of divine favour bestowed upon a scion of one of the most prominent aristocratic families, just as the Muses celebrated Peleus whom Zeus gave a goddess as his wife, regardless of his past crime.

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Proem

1-8 Introduction. Praise of the victor and of Aegina
  1-2(a) Dissociation of the current song from static monuments
    1(a) 'I am not a sculptor'
    1(b)-2(a) so as to make immobile statues [ὥϲτ']
  2(b)-8 Song is urged to embark on every ship and proclaim the victor's fame [ἀλλ']
    2(b)-3(a) 'Embark on every ship and proclaim'
    3(b)-8 Content of the proclamation [ὅτι]
      3(b)-6 Mandatory victory data
        3(b)-5 father's name, victor's name, festival, discipline
        6 age category [participle]
      7-8 The victor has honoured his ancestors and his country [δέ]
        7-8(a) He has honoured the Aeacids
        8(b) and Aegina [τε]

Myth

9-13 First episode. The three sons of Aeacus praying together
  9-11(a) They prayed for Aegina's prosperity [τάν ποτ']
    9-10(a) They prayed
    10(b)-11(a) standing at the altar of Zeus Hellenius [participle]
  11(b) Together they stretched out their hands to the sky [τ']
  12-13 Identification of the subject
    12(a) Peleus and Telamon
    12(b)-13 Phocus [καί]
      12(b) Phocus mentioned by name
      13 his divine lineage
        13(a) 'son of a goddess'
        13(b) identification of his mother [ὅν]
14-18 Break-off. 'Skipping' a story of fratricide
  14-16(b) Break-off [asyndeton]
    14-16(a) 'I am not going to tell about the crime'
      14 'Shame prevents me from telling about the crime'
      15-16(a) consequence of the crime [πῶϲ δή]
        15(a) 'how they left Aegina'
        15(b)-16(a) 'and which deity drove valiant men away' [καί]
    16(b) 'I shall halt' [asyndeton]
  16(c)-18 Motivation [asyndeton; τοι]
    16(c)-17 It is not profitable for the truth to dispay its face unflinching
    18 Silence is often the wisest policy [καί]

19-21 Transition
19-20(a) 'If I have to praise laudable subjects I shall jump far' [εἰ δ']
19(a) Protasis
19(b)-20(a) Apodosis
20(b) 'I have the capacity to do so' [asyndeton]
21 Distance to be covered is specified as 'over the sea' [καί]
22-37(a) Second episode. Wedding of Peleus and Thetis. Peleus and Hippolyta
22-25(a) The Muses sang on the wedding of Peleus and Thetis [δὲ καί]
22-23(a) Just as willingly the Muses sang for the Aeacids
23(b)-25(a) Apollo played the *phorminx* [ἐν δὲ μέcαιc]
25(b)-37(a) Content of their song [αἱ δέ]
25(b)-26(a) First, beginning with Zeus, they sang about Thetisand Peleus [πρώτιcτον μέν]
26(b)-37(a) Episode from this song about Thetis and Peleus [ὥc τε]
26(b)-28 Hippolyta wanted to harm Peleus
26(b)-27(a) Hippolyta wanted to shackle Peleus with treachery
27(b)-28 convincing her husband to be her accomplice [ptc.]
29-31(a) Hippolyta's lies [δέ]
29 Hippolyta made up a false story
30-31(a) Content of this story [ὡc ἆρα]
31(b)-34(a) The true state of affairs [δ']
31(b) It was the other way around
31(c)-34(a) How it really happened [γάρ]
31(c)-32(a) Hippolyta did everything to seduce Peleus
32(b)-34(a) Peleus' reaction [τοῖο δ']
32(b) 'Her steep words stimulated his feeling'
33-34(a) Peleus rejected Hippolyta [δ']
33(a) He rejected her immediately
33(b)-34(a) Out of fear for Zeus' wrath [participle]
34(b)-37(a) Zeus' response [ὁ δ']
34(b)-36 Zeus gave Peleus Thetis as a reward
34(b) Zeus took good notice of Peleus' behaviour
34(c)-36 and gave him Thetis [τε]
34(c)-35(a) main clause
35(b)-36 subclause [ὥcτ']
37(a) After having persuaded Poseidon [participle]
37(b)-39 Epilogue. Poseidon at the Isthmian Games
37(b) Poseidon often travels to the Isthmus [ὅc]
38-39 Brief description of two stages of the Isthmian Games [ἔνθα]
38 Opening ceremony with a sacrifice to the god
39 Athletic competition [καί]
40-41(a) 'Inborn destiny decides everything' [δέ]

Closure

41(b)-54 Earlier victories of the victor and his family
  41(b)-43 Euthymenes [τὺ δ']
    41(b)-42 Euthymenes has won two victories in Aeginetan games
    43 He has thus followed after Pytheas and honours his race [ἤτοι; switch of addressee]
  44-46(a) Pytheas
    44 The Nemean and Delphinian Games are famous [μέν]
    45-46(a) Pytheas has won there and in Megara [δ']
      45 Pytheas has won at the Delphinian Games [τ']
      46(a) and in Megara [τ']
  46(b)-47 'I am glad that the whole city fights for noble things' [δ']
  48-49 Menander
    48-49(a) 'Sweet was the recompense you got with Menander' [ἴσθι]
    49(b) 'A trainer must come from Athens' [δ']
  50-54 Themistius
    50-51 Introduction of Themistius; contrast with Menander [εἰ δέ]
      50(a) 'If you come to Themistius,'
      50(b)-51 'praise him without reserve'
        50(b) 'shrink back no longer'
        50(c)-51(a) 'give your voice' [asyndeton]
        51(b) 'raise the sails to the crossbar of the mast-top' [δ']
    52-54 Content of the praise [asyndeton]
      52-53(a) 'record his double victory'
      53(b)-54 'and that he dedicated the crown' [δ']

METRICAL ANALYSIS

Strophe/Antistrophe

1	— — ⏑ — ⏒ — ⁝ ⏑ ⁝ — — ⏑ — ⏒ — ⁝ ⏑ ⁝	×—⏑—×—⏑——⏑—×—⏑	×s×s’s×s×dd×s‖
	— — — ⁝ ⏑ ⁝ ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — — ⁝ — ⏑ — ‖	—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑—‖	
2	— ⏑⏑ ⁝ — ⏑⏑ — — ⁝ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁝	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×⁝—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⁝	dd×dd×s–‖
	⏒ — | ⏑ — — ‖	×—|⏑——‖	
3	— ⏑ — ⁝ ⏒ — ⁝ ⏑ ⁝ — — — ⏑ — ‖	—⏑—×—⏑—×—⏑—‖	s×s×s‖
4	— — ⁝ ⏑ ⁝ — ⏒ — ⏑ ⏖ | — — ⏑ — ‖	×—⏑—×—⏑—|×—⏑—‖	×s×s×s‖
5	— — ⁝ ⏑ ⁝ — ⏒ — ⏑⏑ ⁝ — ⁝ ⏑⏑ — ‖	×—⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—‖	×s×dd‖
6	— — ⁝ ⏑ ⏖ — — ⏑ — — |	×—⏑—×—⏑—×|	×s×s×s×s–‖‖
	— ⏑ — ⁝ ⏒ — ⁝ ⏑ — — ‖‖	—⏑—×—⁝⏑——‖‖	

Epode

1	⏒ — ⏑ ⏑ ⁝ — ⏑ ⏑ — ⏒ |	×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×|	×dd×s×s–‖
	— ⏑ — ⏒ — ⏑ ⁝ — — ‖	—⏑—×—⏑——‖	
2	— ⏑⏑ — ⁝ ⏑ ⏑ ⁝ — — |	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×|	dd×s×s×s‖
	— ⏑ — ⏒ | — ⏑ — ⏒ — ⁝ ⏑ — ‖	—⏑—×|—⏑—×—⏑—‖	
3	— — ⁝ ⏑ ⏑ ⁝ — ⏑ ⏑ | — — |	×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑|—×|	×dd×s×s‖
	— ⏑ — ⁝ ⏒ — ⏑ — ‖	—⏑—×—⏑—‖	
4	— — ⁝ ⏑ — — — ⁝ ⏑ ⏑ — ⁝	×—⏑—×—⏑⏑—	×s×d’dd×s‖
	— ⏑ ⏑ ⁝ — ⏑ ⏑ — ⏒ ⁝ — ⏑ — ‖	—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑—‖	
5	— — ⏑ ⏑ — ⁝ ⏑ ⏑ — — ⁝ — ⏑ — ‖	×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—⏑—‖	×dd×s‖
6	— ⏑ — ⁝ — — ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑ ⁝ — — — |	—⏑—×—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×—|	s×ddd×s–‖‖
	⏑ — — ‖‖	⏑——‖‖	

Remarks

The ode has three triads. The metre represents one of the most common types in the epinician odes: the so-called dactylo-epitrites. Such odes are characterized by a complex repetition of the elements dd (—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—, = D in the notation of Maas, used in the Snell-Maehler edition) and sxs (—⏑—×—⏑—, = E in Maas' notation), or single s (—⏑—, = e). Occurences of single d elements (—⏑⏑—) are rare in odes of this type; there is no example in this ode. The continuation of a sequence after one of these metrical groups is nearly always effected by means of a 'link-anceps' (*anceps interpositum*), mostly realized as a long syllable. Juxtaposition is rare. In this ode we have s's in str. 1 and d'd in ep. 4. As it is common with odes of this type the vast majority of verses end with the sequence ... xs(−)‖ (str. 5 is the only exception). See further Sicking, *Griechische Verslehere*, pp. 162-7.

Str. 1 has three *Wechselschnitts*. The first has not been realized in line 1. There is a preferred word end before the three final syllables (realized four out of six times). No word end occurs between the three syllables directly preceding the central *Wechselschnitt*, nor between the two syllables following it. Similarly, there is no word end before the first *Wechselschnitt*. The juxtaposition (s's) is in itself not uncommon in odes of this type, but there is a tendency for this to occur towards the end of a strophe or epode (see Sicking, *Griechische Verslehere*, p. 162, § 6.2 *sub* 3). Str. 1, ep. 4 and ep. 6 are the only lines in this ode which have the sequence s→d→s.

Str. 2 has a preferred word end after the eighth syllable, after the long anceps, excepting line 20 where word end occurs after the tenth. There is also a preferred word end after the fifteenth syllable, with the exception of line 44 (where it occurs after the fourteenth), unless one regards the word end after the relative pronoun (ὅν) as a structural word boundary.[1] There is a fixed word end before the clausula (... ⏑——‖). No word end occurs directly before the fixed word end, nor between the seventh and the eighth syllables. No word end occurs between the three final syllables.

Str. 3 is structured by a *Wechselschnitt* in the middle, which is, however, not realized in line 9 (unless we interpret τε | καί). The word end after the third syllable has been realized four out of six

[1] Word end after relative pronouns is not to be regarded as a potentially structural word boundary according to the criteria of Van Raalte, *Rhythm and Metre*, pp. 164/5.

times. No word end occurs between the syllables directly before or after this preferred word end.

Str. 4 has a fixed word end after the eighth syllable and a *Wechselschnitt* in the beginning. No word end occurs between the syllables direly before and directly after the fixed word end and *Wechselschnitt.* The resolution of the eighth syllable occurs only in line 10.

Str. 5 has two *Wechselschnitts*. The latter has not been realized in line 29. Str. 5 is the only verse in this ode that does not end with the sequence xs(–)||.

Str. 6 has a fixed word end after the ninth syllable and a preferred word end before the clausula (... ⏑——||), the only exception being line 42. The word ends after the second and after the twelfth syllable both occur four out of six times. No word end occurs directly before and after the fixed word end, nor directly before the preferred word end preceding the three final syllables. The resolution of the fourth syllable occurs only in the first triad (lines 6 and 12; in line 12 word end occurs within the resolved *longum*).

Ep. 1 has a fixed word end after the xddx sequence. The preferred word ends indicated occur two out of three times.

Ep. 2 has two fixed word ends. The preferred word ends indicated occur two out of three times.

Ep. 3 has two fixed word ends. The preferred word ends indicated occur two out of three times.

Ep. 4 has no fixed word end. The preferred word ends indicated occur two out of three times. No word end occurs between the three final syllables. Str. 1, ep. 4 and ep. 6 are the only lines in this ode which have the sequence s→d→s. For the relatively rare sequence sxd'dd cf. *fr.* 133.

Ep. 5 has no fixed word end. The preferred word ends indicated occur two out of three times. No word end occurs between the three final syllables.

Ep. 6 has a fixed word end before the clausula (... ⏑——||). The preferred word ends indicated occur two out of three times. No word end occurs between the three final syllables. Str. 1, ep. 4 and ep. 6 are the only lines in this ode which have the sequence s→d→s.

Interpretation

Str. 1 is both the longest and the most complex verse of the ode. It begins with a jambic sequence. Strings of single short elements are prominent in the metrical profile of this ode, especially in the stro-

phe/antistrophe. But only in this verse there is juxtaposition within the single short sequence. After four single short elements we get the double short sequence that is characteristic for dactylo-epitrites. At the very end of the verse there is a transition back to a single short element. The sequence xddxs, which is the second half of this verse, will re-appear a number of times, especially in the epode, and can be regarded as one of the two 'themes' which determine the rhythmical pattern of this ode.

Str. 2 resumes the dd sequence from str. 1 and then repeats the 'theme' xddxs, but now with a pendant ending. The clausula (⏑——‖) is stressed by means of the fixed word end preceding it. It will be echoed by str. 6, ep. 1 and ep. 6. The preferred word ends effect a variation of a falling and a rising rhythm: ⥱⏑⏑⁞⥱⏑⏑—×⁞⥱⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⁞×⃗—|⏑⃗——‖.

Str. 3 repeats the 'theme' of single short elements from str. 1, but now in its pure form, without juxtaposition. The beginning is falling; the ending is blunt.

Str. 4 is a rising variation of str. 3. The fixed word end marks the xs sequence and emphasizes the rising rhythm: ×⃗—⏑—×—⏑—| ×⃗—⏑—‖. As in str. 3 the ending is blunt.

Str. 5 begins as a repetition of the rising single short rhythm of str. 4 and then continues with the dd sequence which we have heard already in str. 1 and twice in str. 2. Thus this verse is an inversion of the xddxs theme.

Str. 6 is an extended variation of str. 4 with a pendant ending. The long string of single short elements recalls the beginning of str. 1. The clausula (⏑——⦀) is stressed by means of the preferred word end preceding it. This is an echo of str. 2; the echo adds to the impression that the strophe/antistrophe has come to a conclusion.

Ep. 1 re-establishes the 'theme' xddxs. An extra single short element with a pendant ending is added. The fixed word end sets the double short elements apart from the single short sequence and effects a variation of a rising and a falling rhythm: ×⃗—⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×| ⥱⏑—×—⏑——‖. This verse has the clausula (⏑——‖), which is an echo of str. 2 and 6; here, however, the bridge and the preferred word end (—͡⏑⁞——‖) aim at camouflaging the echo.

Ep. 2 is a falling variation of ep. 1 with an additional single short element: it begins with the sequence ddxs, which is a repetition of the 'theme' xddxs without the initial anceps; and then ends with a string of single short elements. As in ep. 1 the fixed word ends set apart the double short and single short elements; unlike in ep. 1, however, the rhythm is continuously falling: ⥱⏑⏑—⏑⏑—×| ⥱⏑—×|⥱⏑—×—⏑—‖. Unlike in ep. 1, the ending is blunt.

Ep. 3 is a repetition of ep. 1 with a blunt ending, and thus a shortened, rising variation of ep. 2. The fixed word ends effect a falling rhythm after the rising beginning: x⃗—⏑⏑—⏑⏑|⇁x| ⇁⏑—x—⏑—‖. The sequence after the second fixed word end is an exact repetiton of the sequence in ep. 2 after the second fixed word end there.

Ep. 4 is a complex variation on the 'theme' xddxs. With str. 1, this is the only verse where juxtaposition occurs; here, however, we have juxtaposition of double short elements. The verse begins with the sequence xsxd, which can be interpreted as an inversion of this theme and which is a shortened variation of str. 5. The second half of the verse (marked by a preferred word end) is a falling variation of this theme and thus a repetition of the first half of ep. 2. The sequence s→d→s recalls str. 1.

Ep. 5 represents the 'theme' xddxs in its pure and unaltered form. This adds to the impression that the system comes to a conclusion. The preferred word ends effect a variation between a rising and a falling rhythm: x⃗—⏑⏑—⁞⏑⃗⏑——⁞⇁⏑—‖.

Ep. 6 is a variation on ep. 4. The sequence is identical, but here the beginning is falling, the end is pendant and there is no juxtaposition. The sequence s→d→s recalls ep. 4 and str. 1. The clausula (⏑——‖‖) is stressed by means of the fixed word end preceding it. This is an echo of str. 2, 6, and ep. 1. In the fashion of circular composition, the echo of the first line of the epode adds to the impression that the triad has come to a conclusion, especially since the same echo marks the conclusion of strophe and antistrophe.

Conclusion

The compositional principles underlying the metrical structure of the ode are relatively lucid. It is characterized by a number of variations on two 'themes': the sequence xddxs and strings of single short elements connected with ancipitia (xsxs). Both 'themes' are introduced in the opening verse. Str. 2 and 5 vary upon the 'theme' xddxs; the other verses in the strophe/ antistrophe are homogenous single short strings: in these there is a development from falling and blunt to rising and blunt to rising and pendant.

The epode further explores the 'theme' xddxs. The opening line of the epode begins with it; ep. 2 begins with a falling variation of the theme; ep. 3 again begins with the theme in its basic rising form; ep. 4 is a complex variation on the theme, combing an inversion of it with a falling variation that echoes the beginning of

ep. 2. Ep. 5 represents the 'theme' xddxs in its pure and unaltered form. This adds to the impression that the triad comes to a conclusion. Ep. 6, then, is a falling, blunt variation of ep. 4 without the juxtaposition. In the epode we have no more homogenous single short verses. But the 'theme' xsxs does appear in the second halfs of ep. 1, 2 and 3.

Apart from the two 'themes' there is a clausula effect, i.e., a repetition of the sequence ⏑—— at the very end of several verses, emphasized by a fixed or preferred word end directly preceding it. The clausula is introduced in str. 2. The echo of the clausula in str. 6 marks the closure of the strophe/antistrophe. The same clausula re-appears in ep. 1, but there it is camouflaged. The system as a whole, finally, ends with the clausula, marked by a fixed word end.

COMMENTARY

Strophe A

1-8

I am no sculptor, so that I would make statues that will rest and that stand still on their own bases. No, sweet song, go on every merchantman and in every galley from Aegina, proclaiming everywhere that Lampon's son Pytheas of wide power has won the crown of the pancration, while he does not yet show the soft ripeness of the blossom of grape-vines on his cheeks to his mother. To the hero-spearsmen sprung from Cronus and Zeus and from the golden Nereids, to the Aeacids, he has brought honour, and to his mother-city, the land of strangers.

1-5

While Pindar elsewhere emphasizes the permanence of his odes by comparing them to monuments (*N.*4.81, *N.*8.46-8), here the advantages of poetry over actual monuments are emphasised: poetry travels easily around the world and so does the fame of the victor who is celebrated by it. Whereas emphasising the analogy between material and musical monuments focusses on the durability of the latter, and consequently on delivering the victor's glory to posterity,[1] the rhetoric here aims at emphasising the capacity of song to travel and spread the victor's fame to his contemporaries abroad.[2] Cf. ἐγὼ δέ τοι

---

[1] On the analogy between material and musical monuments in Pindar's odes see Steiner, *HSCPh* 95, 1993, 159-80. On the prominent role of metaphoric ἀγάλματα and ἀναθήματα see also Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 163-94. On victory statues see esp.: W.J. Raschke, 'Images of Victory. Some New Considerations of Athletic Monument', in: *The Archaeology of the Olympics. The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity* (ed. W.J. Raschke), Madison 1988; W.W. Hyde, *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art*, Washington D.C. 1921 (on Aeginetan sculptors: pp. 122-6); S. Lattimore, 'The Nature of Early Greek Victor Statues', in: *Coroebus Triumphs. The Alliance of Sports and the Arts* (ed S.J. Bandy), San Diego 1987.

[2] The scholiast's anecdote (φαcὶ ὅτι οἱ τοῦ Πυθέου οἰκεῖοι προcῆλθον τῶι Πινδάρωι παρακαλοῦντεc ὅπωc εἰc αὐτὸν γράψηι ἐπίνικον· Πινδάρου δὲ αἰτήcαντοc τριcχιλίαc δραχμὰc ἔφαcαν ἐκεῖνοι κάλλιον εἶναι χάλκεον ἀνδριάντα ποιῆcαι τῆc αὐτῆc τιμῆc ἢ τὸ ποίημα. χρόνωι δὲ ὕcτερον γνωcιμαχήcαντεc ἐπανῆλθον τὸ αὐτὸ διδόντεc· ὁ δὲ ἐξονειδίζων αὐτοὺc οὕτωc ἤρξατο, Σ. 1a, III 89 Dr.) is useful in that it reminds us of the fact that a statue was a real alternative to a victory ode. The Charioteer of Delphi, commemorating a victory of Polyzalus, tyrant of Gela and brother of Hieron of Syracuse, in the Pythian Games of 478 or 474 (see now Maehler on B.4, II, pp. 65-7, with further references), is an example of a

φίλαν πόλιν | μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων ἀοιδαῖς, | καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου | θᾶσσον καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾶι | ἀγγελίαν πέμψω | ταύταν, *O.*9.21-26 (with emphasis on the speed by which song travels), and τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολὰν | μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται, *P.*2.67/8 (with emphasis on the value of song). In τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει, | εἴ τις εὖ εἴπηι τι· καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν | ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεί, *I.*4.40-2, durability and the capacity of song to travel are combined. For the Panhellenic dimension of Pindar's profession see introduction, pp. 7-11.

1. οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ'

The **ὥστε**-clause formulates what would have been the consequence of ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ'. As this statement in the main clause is said to be not the case, the consequence is not the case either.[3]

Syntactically the more common procedure is to include in the negated main clause a pronoun or adverb with demonstrative force (such as οὕτω, τηλίκος, or τοσοῦτος), on which the subordinate clause introduced by ὥστε depends. The pronoun or adverb serves as an extra signal to direct the audience towards the interpretation that the negation in the main clause applies to the subordinate clause too. Thus, e.g., A.*Ag.*1074/5, Thgn.413/4, S.*OT* 594/5, *El.*964-6, E.*Phoen.*1612-4, *Ba.*452, *IA* 391-3, *Rhes.*859/60, Hdt.2.120, 5.30, etc. For the absence of such an anticipation of the subordinate clause, cf. ὕπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ' ἔπλευσας, οὐχ ὅλων | στρατηγός, ὥστ' Αἴαντος ἡγεῖσθαί ποτε, S.*Aj.*1105/6; thus also: *ibid.*1339/40, *Ant.*1250, A.*Eu.*227, E.*Alc.*210/1, *HF* 326, *Suppl.*518/9, 875-7, *IT* 1325/6, Th.3.23.5, X.*HG* 4.8.23. There are four Pindaric examples of consecutive ὥστε with an infinitive, of which three are to be found in this ode: *h.l.*, 35, 50; *O.*9.74 is the other one. See also Ruijgh, *Autour de "τε épique"*, p. 981.

1-2. ἐλινύσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος | ἑσταότ'

The immobility of the statues is stressed. They 'will stand still (idle) always on the same base.' **ἐλινύω**, 'resting,'[4] is used with connotations of idleness; cf. μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώιαν | μηδὲ τούσδ' ὕμνους· ἐπεί τοι | οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν, *I.*2.44-6; A.*Pr.*52/3 (cf. *ibid.* 529). Similarly, **ἕστηκα** has the connotation 'stand idle,' as often in Homer (*Il.*4.246, 365-8, etc.).

For **αὐτός** without the article used in the sense 'the same', cf. ἦρχε δὲ τῶι αὐτὴν ὁδόν, ἥν περ οἱ ἄλλοι, *Od.*8.107; 10.263, 16.138/9, *Il.*12.223-7, Hes.*Sc.*35-8. Pindar frequently does use the article in this sense (*O.*13.38,

---

statue that, as for the period and the victor's milieu, could have been a Pindaric ode.

[3] For a different opinion see Froidefond, *Lire Pindare*, pp. 77/8.

[4] Often used in medical prescriptions, e.g., καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἐλινύειν τὸ σῶμα καὶ κατακεῖσθαι, Hp.*Fract.*14; ἐλινύειν οὐ ξυμφέρει, ἀλλὰ γυμνάσια, *Epid.*6.1.5.

O.1.45, *N*.7.104). See also Kühner-Gerth, *Satzlehre*, Vol. 1 p. 630 (§ 465.4 Anmerk. 6.f.).

Whereas ἀνδριάϲ specifically means 'statue' —in bronze (Arist.*EN* 1041^{a}11), wood (*P*.5.40-2, Pl.*R*.515a), or stone (Hdt.1.92.2, Pl.*ibid.*) —of a man (occasionally of a female figure, cf. Ath.10.425f), **ἄγαλμα** may be used to refer to any concrete representation of 'glory', 'honour'. Thus it may refer, e.g., to a statue—of a god (Hdt.1.131, Isoc.9.57, etc.) or of a man (cf. Pl.*Men*.97d, *GDI* 5421 [Delos][5]) —, to a monument (*N*.10.67, of a tombstone), a victory ode (*N*.3.13; see my note, pp. 617/8, with further references), etc. Thus the noun is susceptible to both the rejected and the preferred type of immortalization of the victor; the focus is on the qualifications: Pindar does make ἀγάλματα, but not of the type that stand still on bases.

For the shortening of the α cf. τεθνᾰότα, *N*.10.74; τετρᾰόροιϲιν, *N*.7.93.

2. ἀλλ'

ἀλλά is a signal indicating that what follows substitutes the idea rejected in the preceding lines. Notwithstanding the imperative that follows, the value of ἀλλά here has more in common with occurrences of the type 'οὐκ *a* ἀλλά *b*', where there is envisaged a complete substitution of *b* for *a* ('I do not make statues that will stand still; no, on the contrary, I make a song that will travel everywhere'),[6] than with cases of what is sometimes referred to as 'adhortative ἀλλά', where the act of speaking is 'replaced' in a turn towards action.[7] The effect of the contrastive bipartite presentation with ἀλλά is rhetorical: the preceding negated proposition helps to define the scope of the claim that replaces it, and adds relief to this claim by providing a contrastive foil. The formulation of the positive claim in the form of a directive expression, involving an apostrophe of the song that is currently being sung, aims at avoiding the predictability of a symmetrical expression (see introduction, pp. 51/2), at adding emphasis to the positive claim, and at giving it an air of self-evidence, in that it is suggested that the song, unaided and on its own, will spread about the fame and glory of the victor it celebrates.

2-3. ἐπὶ πάϲαϲ ὁλκάδοϲ ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά, | ϲτεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίναϲ

The song that is currently being sung is urged to embark on every ὁλκάϲ and (every) ἄκατοϲ leaving Aegina and proclaim the victor's

[5] The strict distinction between ἀνδριάϲ, as the proper noun for a statue of a mortal, and ἄγαλμα, a statue for a god, as made in Gorg.*Hel*.18 and Plb.21.29.9, is not supported by actual usage.

[6] As in: οὔτοι ϲυνεχθεῖν, ἀλλὰ ϲυμφιλεῖν ἔφυν, S.*Ant*.523; οὐ δίκαι ϲυναντόμενοϲ, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, *O*.2.96.

[7] See Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 35-9, 49/50.

fame and glory all over the world. πάcαc both underscores the wide impact of Pindar's song (cf. παντᾶι, *O*.9.24) and is suggestive of the size of the Aeginetan fleet. Pindar does not specify exactly how he imagines his song to circulate. Some scholars may wish to see here a reference to circulation of the ode in writing; alternatively, some may think of (semi-) professional Aeginetan singers, perhaps members of the chorus,[8] traveling abroad for the specific purpose of performing this song (among others). However, πάcαc is designed to conjure up a much wider impact, according to a much less regulated scenario: we are invited to imagine that Pindar's audience, when having returned to their duties after the victory celebrations are over, have his song in their heads and sing it in foreign harbours, thus contributing to the spreading of the victor's fame. Pindar envisages a similar kind of unregulated oral transmission of his songs in those passages where he stresses that his song will ensure that the victor's fame flies from mouth to mouth.[9] Here he associates the spreading of the victor's fame with the radius of action of Aeginetan ships, thus presenting Aegina's naval activity as contributory to the victor's fame and glory.

Pindar's mentioning especially these two types of ships is in the first place motivated by the fact that poetic diction has more affinity with graphic and specific words[10] than with generalities. Moreover, the ἄκατοc, being a ship renowned for its speed, associates the spreading of the victor's fame with swiftness (cf. *O*.9.21-6, see my general note on 1-5 above). Finally—as the ὁλκάc was a trading vessel and the ἄκατοc, for its speed, was popular with pirates—the ὁλκάc and the ἄκατοc may be taken to symbolize the two kinds of naval activity in which Aegina had specialized: trade and piracy.[11]

ὁλκάc is a general term for a sailing ship without oars. Cf. Hdt.3.135, Th.7.7.3, E.*Cyc*.505, Strab.11.496, D.S.42.2.3. Such a boat was called ὁλκάc (~ ὁλκή, ἕλκω, cf. ὁλκαῖοc, Nic.*Th*.268), because a ship powered

[8] For the choral performance of Pindar see my notes on the proem of *N*.3 (pp. 242, 249, 267/8).

[9] The idea of the victor's fame flying from mouth to mouth underlies passages where the *laudandus* is described as airborne and passages where the poet associates his own art with wings. Homer's art is winged in *N*.7.20-3. For the Muses having wings cf. *I*.1.64/5, B.*fr*.20b.3/4, Archil.181.11 W. (with Plu.*Garrulit*.10 [507a], *Amat*.3 [750b]). For the *laudandus* being airborne, cf. *N*.6.48/9, Thgn.237-9, *Il*.19.384-6; cf. also *P*.8.33, 88-91 with my notes, pp. 517/8, 592. See also my *CPh* 89, 1994, 307.

[10] In the case of Pindar this applies mainly to the nouns. For 'colourless verbs' see introduction, pp. 31/2.

[11] For Aeginetan piracy, see Figueira, *Aegina*, 202/3; for Aeginetan trade see *ibid.* 230-286. See also Amit, 9-16.

solely by sail had to be towed in and out of harbor. These ships were mainly used as trading vessels; when they participated in naval actions, they served to transport supplies (ϲιταγωγῶν ὁλκάδων, Hdt.7.191, cf. Th.6.44) or men and were always accompanied by men-of-war to do the fighting (Morrison & Williams, *Oared Ships*, pp. 244/5; Casson, *Ships and Seamanship*, p. 169). The noun **ἄκατοϲ** (used once more by Pindar: *P.*11.40) can be used vaguely to mean no more than 'boat,' but in its specialized sense it refers to a specific kind of merchant galley, equipped with oars and rigged with one single square sail (Lucian.*VH* 1.5, Plb.1.73.2). It seems to have been a fast ship, popular among pirates (Strab.11.495, Th.4.67.3). Ancient historians frequently list ἄκατοι as a class opposed to men-of-war on the one hand (Th.7.59.3) and pure sailing vessels on the other (Plut.*Mor.*466b/c). The hull was of the pointed cutwater type. ἄκατοι were used on rivers (*PSI* 58.4; *P.Cairo Zen.*59430.12-13) as well as open water. The size varies considerably: the smallest ones could be handled by one person (Hermesianax *fr.*7.4 [ed. Powell, *Coll.Alex.*], of Charon's ferry; Polyaenus 8.46), whereas Hdt.7.186 speaks of ϲιταγωγοὶ ἄκατοι and Lucian's (*loc.cit.*) ἄκατοι are large enough to transport over fifty men (Casson, pp. 159/60).

For the variation of prepositions, cf. ἐκ...καὶ ἀπό, 7; παρὰ πεζοβόαιϲ ἵπποιϲ τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαιϲ, *N.*9.34, etc. See further introduction, pp. 51/2. In hexameter poetry ἐπὶ νηόϲ and ἐν(ὶ) νηί seem to be semantically exchangeable alternatives for saying 'on a ship.' A full survey is provided by M.P. Cuypers, *Apollonius Rhodius. Argonautica 2.1-310. A Commentary*, Diss. Leiden 1997, pp. 318/9. For **γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά** cf. *I.*2.7/8, *N.*9.3, etc. The victory celebrations are γλυκύϲ, because they are pleasant, celebrating a joyful event.[12] For the *apostrophe* cf. *N.*4.44, *O.*2.1/2. For the personification of ἀοιδά cf. *N.*4.3.

3. διαγγέλλοιϲ'

The song is urged to embark on every ship leaving Aegina, in order to 'proclaim in every direction' that[13] Pytheas has won a victory. The value of the prefix is that the victory is proclaimed 'in different directions' (as in διαπέμπω, διαφορέω, etc.).

The verb occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar, but cf. E.*Hel.*436, Pl.*Prt.*317a, etc. A herald was at the Games to 'proclaim' the victor's name (cf. *P.*1.32/3). Pindar metaphorically identifies himself with such a herald (cf. *P.*9.1-3, *N.*6.57, *O.*6.90/1, *P.*2.3/4).

4. Λάμπωνοϲ υἱὸϲ

Pytheas was the son of Lampon (*I.*5.21, *I.*6.3). Lampon's father was Cleonicus (*I.*6.16). Pytheas' younger (cf. *I.*6.6/7) brother was Phyla-

---

[12] Slater *s.v.* γλυκύϲ (p. 110) groups these instances under the heading 'sweet in sound'. There is, however, no instance in Pindar of sound being qualified as γλυκύϲ without connection to victory-celebrations.

[13] For the position of ὅτι at the very end of a verse, cf. line 46 below; *P.*10.69, *P.*2.44, *O.*3.13, etc.

cidas (*I.*5.17-21, *I.*6.57-62). The mother's brother of Pytheas and Phylacidas was Euthymenes (*I.*6.58-62, lines 41, 43 below). This family belonged to the clan of the Psalychiads (*I.*6.63). They are said to belong to the οἶκος of Themistius (line 50 below, *I.*6.65). Probably Themistius was the father of Lampon's wife and of Euthymenes.[14] The family had a strong athletic tradition, but of Lampon no victories are mentioned (cf. also φαίης κέ νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν, *I.*6.72). In *I.*6.66-73 (for Phylacidas) Lampon is praised at length for giving care to his work, bringing his city honour, being kind to strangers, keeping measure in his thoughts and doings, and being honest. Lampon is also mentioned in B.13.68 and 226. See further my *CQ* 45, 1995, 319-23.

It is quite probable that our Lampon was related to the Lampon mentioned by Herodotus (ἐν δὲ Πλαταιῆισι ἐν τῶι στρατοπέδωι τῶν Αἰγινητέων ἦν Λάμπων ὁ Πυθέω, Αἰγινητέων τὰ πρῶτα, Hdt.9.78). See Fennell, II, p. 47, who gives a "mostly hypothetical" stemma illustrating that, "according to the *Attic* habits of Nomenclature," Herodotus' Lampon may be the elder cousin of our Lampon.

4. εὐρυσθενής

It is no surprise that a victor in the pancration is praised for his σθένος. The games, and especially disciplines like wrestling, boxing, and the pancration, are also elsewhere associated with strength. Cf. line 39 below, *N.*3.16, with my notes (p. 273, with further references). In Homer εὐρυσθενής is a fixed Homeric epithet of Poseidon (*Il.*7.455, 8.201, *Od.*13.140). Pindar uses it for Poseidon (*O.*13.80), Apollo (*I.*2.18), Telamon (*N.*3.36), and Heracles' γέννα (*O.*7.22/3). Only here does it qualify a mortal. Although Pindar's usage of the adjective is more flexible than Homer's, the nautical context here helps to evoke the Homeric connotations with Poseidon. The association of the victor with the god of the seas is functional in that it connects athletic prowess with naval activity, a theme that is very much present in the opening lines of this ode (see also line 9 below).

5. νίκη

The mss. have νικῆ (νικῆι?) which does not make sense. Heyne's νίκη (cf. Theoc.6.46, 7.40, most likely an Aeolic form, see A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus*, Cambridge 1950, I p. lxiii, II p. 124) is certainly correct. The choice of the imperfect is motivated by the pragmatic function of the verb. Since it is clear to all present at the performance of this victory ode that someone must have been victorious, the verb νίκη lacks focus function. The point of issue is who was vic-

---

[14] Thus A. Severyns, *Bacchylide, Essai biographique*, Liège 1933, 41.

torious, and where, and in what discipline, so that Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας and Νεμείοις and παγκρατίου each have focus function in a higher degree than νίκη.[15]

For the verbal aspect, too, it is illustrative to compare νίκη μὰν οὐδάλλος, ἀνήσσατοι δ' ἐγένοντο, Theoc.6.46 (*fin.*): since the reader knows that a singing contest is taking place, he naturally expects information about the outcome. The verb νίκη therefore lacks focus-function, which explains the choice of the imperfect ('And who was the winner? Nobody'). Fennell in his note on the verb here observes that "in chronological records the imp. ἐνίκα 'was victor' (for the Olympiad, Pythiad &c.) is as natural as ἦρχε 'was archon.'" In such lists the verb typically lacks focus-function.

5. παγκρατίου στέφανον

Cf. ἁβρὸν |...παγκρατίου...| μυρσίνας στέφανον, *I.*8.72-4. For an acc. object with νικάω denoting the prize won, cf. ἐνίκα | Ἀντιοχὶς φυλὴ δαιδάλεον τρίποδα, Simon.147 Bergk (= 77 Diehl).

6. οὔπω γένυσι φαίνων τέρειναν ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν

'While he did not yet show the soft ripeness of the blossom of the grape-vine on his cheeks to his mother'. ματέρ' is a dative governed by φαίνων. γένυσι has a locative force. Pytheas has not yet reached the age of the first hairs on his chin. This is a very poetic but unambiguous way of saying that Pytheas successfully competed in the age category of the ἀγένειοι.[16] Conventions of the genre demand that Pindar explicitly mentiones the age category if the victory was won in any category other than the ἄνδρες (for more details see my 'Athletic Age Categories in Victory Odes', forthcoming).

•*Text:* The mss. have τέρειναν. Dreykorn's τερείνας is confirmed by the scholiast (οὔπω τῆς ἁπαλῆς οἰνάνθης τὴν μητέρα ὀπώραν φαίνων, Σ.10c. Dr. III 9), so it must be regarded as an ancient variant. Of these two variants τέρειναν is *difficilior*, resulting in an enallage[17] (τέρην usually qualifies vegetation [*v.i.*], so οἰνάθας rather than ὀπώραν), and must therefore be preferred.[18]

---

[15] See Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, pp. 27-33; *Semantics of the Verb*, esp. pp. 74-82.

[16] "Eine Mittelstufe ἀγένειος zwischen παῖς und ἀνήρ ist für das 5. Jahrhundert nicht nachweisbar," U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, p. 169. But see *IG* XII 5.608. For more details see Klee, pp. 44-6. Cf. also H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Erster Teil, die Siegeslieder*, 2 vols. (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 62), Leiden 1982, II p. 250 with n. 1.

[17] According to the definition of Bers, *Enallage*, 1: "Enallage is the transfer to the governing substantive of an adjective which by logic, or at least convention, belongs with an expressed dependent genitive." For enallage in Pindar, cf. μήλων τε κνισάεσσα πομπά, *O.*7.80; Πυθιόνικος ... ὕμνων θησαυρός, *P.*6.5-8; ὕδατος ... πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν, *O.*1.48; ἐν τέτρασιν παίδων ... γυίοις, *O.*8.68; cf. line 54 below. See also Bers, *Enallage*, 45-8.

[18] De Pauw's conjecture τέρειναν οἰνάνθαν ὀπώρας is what Σ.10a would have

• *Syntax:* **ματέρ'** is either the dative-object of φαίνων, or an accusative, in apposition to ὀπώραν (as the scholia have it). There is no exact parallel in Pindar for a purely metaphorical usage of μάτηρ. Those instances that seem at first sight to be metaphorical (Slater, *s.v.*, sub 3 ["met."]) all have in common that personification is involved, which is often evident from the fact that a vocative is used (μᾶτερ ὦ χρυσοστεφάνων ἀέθλων Οὐλυμπία, *O.*8.1; Ἀκτὶς ἀελίου...| ὦ μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων, *Pae.*9.1/2), or from contextual evidence (παῖδες... Θέμιτος· | ἐθέλοντι δ' ἀλέξειν | Ὕβριν, Κόρου ματέρα θρασύμυθον, *O.*13.8-10)[19]. Apart from this, the fact that ματέρ' precedes ὀπώραν does not make it easier to interpret the former as a metaphorical apposition to the latter. On the other hand, a real mother is not seldom mentioned in comparable contexts as a touch of graphic reality, cf. ἔν τε Μοίσαισι ποτανὸς ἀπὸ ματρὸς φίλας, *P.*5.114, where μάτηρ, like *h.l.* evokes the image of youth; τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰῶνα, *P.*4.186; οὐδὲ μολόντων παρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλως γλυκὺς | ὦρσεν χάριν, *P.*8.85/6 (with my note, pp. 585/6); ὡς δ' ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτες ἄγαγον, *O.*1.46. This strongly pleads in favour of interpreting ματέρ' as a dative governed by φαίνων (for φαίνω c. dat., cf. ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ' ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεύς, *Il.*2.324; Ζεὺς δέ σφι Κρονίδης ἐνδέξια σήματα φαίνων | ἀστράπτει, *Il.*9.236/7, etc.). **γένυσι**, then, must be a locative (cf. τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων, *Il.*1.45; οὐλῇ γενείῳι, *P.Petr.*1.19 (=3.19ᵃ11), etc.).

• *Semantics:* **τέρην** is pre-eminently a qualification of vegetation.

Cf. e.g. τέρεν' ἄνθεα ποίης, *Od.*9.449; τέρεινα φύλλα, *Il.*13.180, Hes.*fr.*70.21, Melanipp.1.6[20]. It is frequently used, as it is here, to qualify words borrowed from the semantical field of vegetation that serve as metaphors for youth (τόν ῥα νεωον τέρεν ἄνθος ἔχοντ' ἐρικυδεωος ἥβης | παῖδ', Hes.*Th.*988/9; τέρεν ἄνθος ἔχει φιλοκυδεωος ἥβης, *h.Herm.*375).

οἰνάνθα denotes the inflorescence of the grape-vine.

Cf. ἡ πρώτη ἔκφυσις τῆς σταφυλῆς, *Suda*, cf. Thphr.*CP* 3.14.8; Λεσβίης νέκταρ οἰνάνθας, Call.*fr.*115; [S.*fr.*255.4 R], E.*Ph.*231, Ar.*Av.*588,

---

liked to read (ἡ δὲ ὀπώρα οὐκ ἔστι τῆς οἰνάνθης μήτηρ, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον· προανθεῖ γὰρ πρῶτον, εἶτα ὀπώρα γίνεται ... μήτηρ δὲ τοῦ γενειάσκειν γίνεται ἡ ὥρα), but as the text of both MSS. can be understood as it stands, De Pauw's conjecture is unnecessary.

[19] Μάτηρ ἀκόντων, *fr.*6bb, which lacks context, can not serve as a parallel either. Nor can the fairly numerous cases in which a city is called μάτηρ (Αἴγινα φίλα μᾶτερ, *P.*8.98, cf. *O.*6.100, 9.20, *I.*1.1, *Pae.*2.28/9) for one can never be sure whether the city or the eponymous nymph or goddess is referred to (nor can one be sure whether such a difference mattered to Pindar [cf. e.g. *P.*9.4ff., *P.*12.1-3]).

[20] Occasionally also of persons, but—except for the Homeric τέρενα χρόα, *Il.*4.237, etc.—exclusively of girls (παιδὶ τερείνηι, Thgn.261; τέρεινα νύμφα, E.*Cyc.*515; παρθένος τέρεινα, Hippon.90).

*Ra.*1320. It may also refer to the inflorescence of the wild vine (Thphr.*HP* 5.9.6, Plin.*HN* 12.132). There is no exect parallel to the metaphorical usage in our passage.[21]

ὀπώρα denotes 'late summer'.

This is the part of the year between the heliacal rising of Sirius (*Il.*5.5, 16.385, 22.27) and of Arcturus (S.*OT* 1137, Hp.*Aer.*10), i.e. the last days of July, all August, and part of September (thus West *ad* Hes.*Op.*,p.378), the season in which the fruits on the trees are ripe (cf. δενδρέων δὲ νόμον Διώνυcοc πολυγαθὴc αὐξάνοι, | ἁγνὸν φέγγοc ὀπώραc, *fr.*153; Alcm.*fr.*20 Page [= 56 Diehl], Thphr.*HP* 9.20.3, etc.).

The metaphorical usages of the noun can be classified in two categories. First, the associations with fruit can become dominant and thus the noun can be used to refer to 'fruit'.

E.g. ὃc ἂν ἀγροίκου ὀπώραc γεύcηται, βοτρύων εἴτε καὶ cύκων, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ὥραν, Pl.*Lg.*844d; S.*Tr.*703, *f*255.8, Ar.*fr.*569.1, X.*HG* 2.4.25, etc.

Second, the connotation 'ripeness' may predominate and ὀπώρα can be used, as it is here, to refer to a period of life, to life's summer, the time of youthful ripeness.

Cf. ὅcτιc ἑὼν καλὸc εἶχεν Ἀφροδίταc | εὐθρόνου μνάcτειραν ἀδίcταν ὀπώραν, *I.*2.4/5; ὑμᾶc δ' ἐπαινῶ μὴ καταιcχύνειν ἐμέ, | ὥραν ἐχούcαc τήνδ' ἐπίcτρεπτον βροτοῖc· | τέρειν' ὀπώρα δ' εὐφύλακτοc οὐδαμῶc· | θῆρεc δὲ κηραίνουcι καὶ βροτοί, τί μήν; A.*Supp.*996-9 (on this passage: H. Friis Johansen & E.W. Whittle *ad loc.*; Silk p. 195; cf. *ibid.* 1015)[22].

Growth of hair in general (Arist.*fr.*7.285.8, *Probl.*878^{b}21ff., 880^{a}35ff., 897^{b}23ff.) and of the beard in particular was closely associated with sexual vigour. At puberty the beard begins to grow and the boy gets the ability to procreate (contrast Arist.*GA* 746^{b}21-4). Thus the beard serves as a symbol for maturity and the first tender hairs on a boy's

---

[21] Chaeremon *fr.*12 (*TrGF* I ed. Snell), πολλὴν ὀπώραν Κύπριδοc εἰcορᾶν παρῆν | ἄκραιcι περκάζουcαν οἰνάνθαc †χρόνου, (cited in Ath.608f) is not of great help to us, in the first place because the passage is probably corrupt (cf. Kaibel's app. *ad* Ath., Nauck's app.), secondly because it is not clear whether the lines are meant to be read metaphorically or not (as referring to female [Meineke; or male, Kaibel] beauty, which Κύπριδοc seems to support, or to 'ripening Cyprian fruit', respectively). This can not be decided from the context in which the fragment is cited, for the immediate context consists of a compilation of poetical citations about flowers (Ath.608d-f, §88), while the wider context, of which this paragraph is a part, is an *encomion* on the beauty of women (Ath.608a-610b).

[22] As ὀπώρα is used for ripe fruits as well as for ripe bodies in the prime of life, the word lends itself for erotic ambiguity (e.g. the personified Opora in Ar.*Pax* 523ff., 706-8; οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε | ἔκκαιρον μήλων προcδέχομαι ῥυτίδα· | ἀλλ' ἀεὶ πεπόθηκα cυνακμάζουcαν ὀπώραν, *AP* 11.417.1-3; ἄλλωc τε ὀπώραν πωλεῖc, ἡ καλή· ἐcτὶ δὲ ἡ cὴ ὀπώρα ἡδίων τῆc ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων, Aristaenetes *Ep.* 2.1 [*Epistolographi Graeci* ed. Herscher]; see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse, Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, Oxford 19912, 64/5). I see, however, no reason to suppose such ambiguity to be present in our passage (in spite of the "saveur érotique" of τέρην, tasted by Van Groningen *ad* Thgn.261).

chin announce his manhood. The analogy with plants, which first blossom before they bear ripe fruit or seed, is constitutive of the *ground* of the imagery.

Cf. φέρειν δὲ cπέρμα πρῶτον ἄρχεται τὸ ἄρρεν ὡc ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἐν τοῖc ἔτεcι δὶc ἑπτὰ τετελεcμένοιc· ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἡ τρίχωcιc τῆc ἥβηc ἄρχεται, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ φυτὰ μέλλοντα cπέρμα φέρειν ἀνθεῖν πρῶτον Ἀλκμαίων φηcὶν ὁ Κροτωνιάτηc, Arist.*HA* 581ᵃ11-3 (Alcmaeon *fr.*A15 Diels). For ἄνθοc ἥβηc, cf. *Il.*13.484, Hes.*Th.*988 (*v.s.*), *fr.*132, *h.Merc.*375 (*v.s.*), Sem.29.6, Tyrt.*fr.el.*10.28 W., Sol.25.1 W.; in Pindar: *P.*4.158. Cf. also ἥβαc | καρπὸν ἀνθήcαντ', *P.*9.109/10 (cf. also πρὸc εὐάνθεμον δ' ὅτε φυὰν | λάχναι νιν μέλαν γένειον ἔφερον, *O.*1.67/8; εὐανθέ' ἁλικίαν, *I.*7.34; παῖc καλὸν ἄνθοc ἔχων, Thgn.994; πρίν cφωϊν ὑπὸ κροτάφοιcιν ἰούλουc | ἀνθῆcαι πυκάcαι τε γένυc εὐανθέϊ λάχνῃ, *Od.*11.319/20). See further Onians, pp. 232/3, Fränkel, *Wege und Formen*, 43-5; Gerber on *O.*1.67 (p. 110); Taillardat, *Images d'Aristophane*, §§ 43-6. See now also D.L. Cairns, '"Ἀωτοc, "Ἀνθοc, and the Death of Archemorus in Bacchylides' Ninth Ode', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10, 1998, 57-73.

Antistrophe A

7-8

The sons of Aeacus, son of Zeus, are Peleus, Telamon and Phocus. Peleus and Telamon are the sons of Aeacus by Endaïs (line 12), daughter of Cheiron, son of Cronus.[23] Phocus is Aeacus' son by the Nereïd Psamathea (line 13).[24] By mentioning—apart from Zeus—both Cronus and the Nereïds in line 7, Pindar emphatically includes Phocus as well as Peleus and Telamon in the notion Αἰακίδαc They are the subject of the verbs in the next sentence (θέccαντο, 10; cτάντεc, πίτναν, 11), which is made explicit in line 12.

7. ἐκ...καὶ ἀπό

Here, as in line 2, two different prepositions are chosen in order to avoid the predictability of a symmetrical expression. See introduction, pp. 51/2. Cf. also ἔκ τε Πύλου καὶ ἀπ' ἄκραc Ταινάρου, *P.*4.174.[25]

---

[23] Cf. Σ.*ad h.l.*, Σ.*ad Il.*16.14, Hyginus, *Fab.*14.8 (45.20 ff.). According to other sources, Endaïs was the daughter of Sciron, cf. Apollod.3.12.6; Plut.*Thes.*10, Paus.2.29.9, Σ.*ad* E.*Andr.*687.

[24] Cf. Hes.*Th.*1003-5, Apollod.3.12.6, Σ.*ad* E.*Andr.*687. The children of Phocus settled in Phocis and gave their name to the country (cf. Paus.2.29.2, 10.1.1, 10.30.4).

[25] See also M. Martinez Valladares, 'Estudio sobre la estructura de las preposiciones ἐκ / ἀπό en literatura arcaica y clasica', *Emerita* 38, 1970, 53-94; B. Moreux, 'Sens non marqué et sens marqué: ΑΠΟ et ΕΚ en prose attique', *BSL* 74.1, 1979, 267-9.

7. ἥρωας αἰχματάς

Cf. δουρικτύπων Αἰακιδᾶν, *N.*7.10. The stength of the Aeacids was almost proverbial: ἀλκὴν μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκεν Ὀλύμπιος Αἰακίδηισι, | νοῦν δ' Ἀμυθαονίδαις, πλοῦτον δ' ἔπορ'[26] Ἀτρείδηισι, Hes.*fr.*203 M/W, cf. *N.*6.46-9.

7. χρυσεᾶν Νηρηΐωδων

χρύσεος is often used by Pindar as an epithet for minor (i.e. non-Olympian[27]) goddesses (χρύσεαι παῖδες εὐβούλου Θέμιτος, *O.*13.8; χρυσεωας...Νίκας, *I.*2.26; χρυσέαν...Μοῖσαν, *I.*8.5). It never qualifies living beings of the male sex (cf. ἀν' ἵπποις χρυσέαις, *O.*8.51; *O.*1.41, *fr.*30.2).[28]

8. Αἰακίδας

In every surviving ode for an Aeginetan victor Aeacus or the Aeacids are mentioned: *O.*8.30, 50, *P.*8.23, 98/9, *N.*3.28, 64, 4.11, 71, 5.8, 53, 6.17, 46, 7.10, 84, 8.13, *I.*5.20, 35, 6.19, 8.13, 22, 9.1, *fr.*242.[29] In ὔμμε τ', ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι, | τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ σαφέστατον ἔμμεν | τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις, *I.*6.19-21, Pindar presents the praise of the Aeacids in an Aeginetan ode as a duty. *P.*8 is the only surviving ode for an Aeginetan victor in which the main narrative section does *not* deal with the Aeacids.

8. ἐγέραιρεν

By being victorious, Pytheas provides the Aeacids, his ancestors, and his mother-city with a γέρας.

•*The idea of a victory being an honour to one's ancestors:* Quality runs in the family. Great deeds of ancestors are manifestations of the quality of the family and result in a favourable expectancy with regard to the qualities of their descendants. A victor, through of his victory, gives positive proof the quality of his family and ancestors.[30] Pytheas, as a member of the Aeginetan elite, is presented as a lineal descendant of the Aeacids. By giving proof of his own quality he also gives additional proof of the quality of his ancestors, and therefore contributes to their fame. Thus Pytheas' prize is also a prize, a γέρας, for the Aeacids.

---

[26] δ' ἔπορ' Dobree : δὲ παρ' *Excerpta* : δέ περ *Suda.*

[27] In Homer also for Aphrodite (*Il.*3.64, *Od.*8.337, and cf. S.*OT* 188).

[28] See further: Duchemin, *REG* 65, 1952, 46-58; *Poète et prophète*, pp. 193-228; Lorimer, *Greek Poetry and Life*, pp. 14-33; Gerber *ad O.*1.1, pp. 10/1.

[29] But not exclusively in odes for Aeginetan victors: *P.*3.87, for Hiero of Syracuse, *O.*13.109; for Xenophon of Corinth.

[30] See also Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, p. 15: "So ist jeder Sieg eine Ehre für Heroen, Heimat, Väter, Anverwandte, denn ihre eigene Areta wird darin mit sichtbar".

•*The idea of a victory being an honour to one's home town:* Often this idea is formulated in terms of the victor 'crowning' his home-town, as, e.g., in εὐάρματος Ἱέρων ἐν ᾇ κρατέων | τηλαυγέσιν ἀνέδησεν Ὀρτυγίαν στεφάνοις, *P.*2.5/6. His victory 'adorns' the city (*N.*2.7/8). The expression νικήσας ἐστεφάνωσε τὴν πόλιν runs like a leitmotiv through the epinician texts of the Hellenistic and Roman eras. The herald at the Games proclaims the name of the victor, together with his father's name and the name of his city (which is thematized in passages like *O.*5.8/9, *I.*3.11-3, *O.*8.20). Thus the victor makes his city 'known' by means of his victory (*P.*9.73/5). The victor's crowns contribute to the fame of his city (*O.*9.19/20, *O.*4.11/2), for he makes it the object of praise (*N.*3.68), and 'enlarges' it (*O.*5.3/4), providing τιμά for it (*I.*1.64-7). He 'brings his city to light' (*O.*5.14), and 'mingles it with flourishing fortune' (*P.*9.71/2).

In Pindar's rhetoric the link between a victory at the Great Games and the good of the community is obvious and unquestionable. As a contrast it may be observed that Xenophanes did question this relationship (*fr.*2 W., esp. οὔτε γὰρ εἰ πύκτης ἀγαθὸς λαοῖσι μετείη | οὔτ' εἰ πενταθλεῖν οὔτε παλαισμοσύνην, | οὐδὲ μὲν εἰ ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν, τόπερ ἐστὶ πρότιμον, | ῥώμης ὅσσ' ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι πέλει, | τοὔνεκεν ἂν δὴ μᾶλλον ἐν εὐνομίῃ πόλις εἴη, 15-9; cf. also Tyrt.*fr.*12 W.).[31]

•*Literature:* On the idea of victory being an honour to one's home town in epinician epigrams, see L. Robert, 'Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes', *L'Épigramme grecque*, Fondation Hardt 14, pp. 181-295, esp. pp. 195-7; L. Robert, 'Sur des inscriptions d'Ephèse. Fêtes, athlètes, empereurs, épigrammes', *Rev. Phil.* 41, 1967, pp. 7-84. On this idea in Pindar see especially, Thummer, *Isthmische*, I, pp. 54-64; S. Saïd & M. Trédé-Boulmer, 'L'éloge de la cité du vainqueur dans les épinicies de Pindare', *Ktema* 9, 1984, 161-170.

8. ματρόπολιν

This noun can be interpreted in three different ways, each of which is functional in the context. First, ματρόπολις means 'mother-city', i.e., Pytheas' home-town (cf. S.*Ant.*1121-3; *OC* 707). Second, it seems likely that ματρόπολιν, following so closely after Αἰακίδας, evokes associations with Aeacus' mother, the nymph Aegina, after whom the island Oenona (line 16) was renamed, cf. Αἴγινα φίλα μᾶτερ, *P.*8.98 (cf. Ζηνός, 7, πατέρος, 10). Third, ματρόπολις can be used to refer to the 'mother-state' as related to her colonies (cf. κεῖνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει μαγαλᾶν πολίων | ματρόπολιν Θήραν γενέσθαι, *P.*4.19/20; cf. also Hdt.7.51.2, etc.). It is historically correct to call Aegina a ματρόπολις, for it had colonies on Crete and in Italy (*N.*4.46,

[31] On this matter: Donlan, *Aristocratic Ideal*, pp. 65, 100.

Strab.7.376), but that seems irrelevant here. However, some sort of 'colonization' is alluded to in lines 15/6. In fact, it may be regarded as a compliment, or as a euphemism, to associate Peleus' exile to Phthia and Telamon's exile to Salamis with Aeginetan colonization.

8. φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν

Praise of hospitality is a *topos* in Pindar's odes. But there is a tendency to praise Aegina as a *polis* for its hospitality (τεθμὸς δέ τις ἀθανάτων καὶ τάνδ' ἁλιερκέα χώραν | παντοδαποῖςιν ὑπέςτακε ξένοις | κίονα δαιμονίαν | —ὁ δ' ἐπαντέλλων χρόνος | τοῦτο πράςςων μὴ κάμοι̣ῳ| Δωριεῖ λαῶι ταμιευομέναν ἐξ Αἰακοῦ, *O.*8.26-30; τὰν πολυξέναν... | ...Δωρίδα νᾶςον Αἴγιναν, *N.*3.2/3; δέξαιτο δ' Αἰακιδᾶν | ἠΰπυργον ἕδος, δίκαι ξεναρκέϊ κοινὸν | φέγγος, *N.*4.11-3; [ξεῖνός εἰμι, *N.*7.61]; οὐ θέμιν οὐδὲ δίκαν | ξείνων ὑπερβαίνοντες, *I.*9.5/6; πόθεν ἔλαβες ναυπρύτανιν | δαίμονα καὶ τὰν θεμίξενον ἀρετ[άν, *Pae.*6.131; only exception *I.*6.70, where Lampon as a private person is praised for it), whereas in odes for non-Aeginetan victors private persons or families are praised for their hospitality (*O.*3.40, *O.*4.14/5, *O.*13.2/3, *P.*3.70/1, *P.*5.56/7, *P.*10.64, *I.*2.39/40); also in *N.*9.1-3 it is really Chromius who is praised for his hospitality (ὄλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δῶμ', 3), not Aetna at large. Cf. also ὦ | δέςποινα παγξε[ίνου χθονός], B.13.94/5; ξενίαν τε [φιλά-] | γλαον γεραίρω, | τὰν ἐμοί, Λάμπων, ς[ύ ..., *ibid.*224-6.

In comparison to passages where Aegina is called πολυξένα (*N.*3.2), or a ξένιον ἄςτυ (*N.*4.23), φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν is a remarkably far-reaching formulation. In archaic Greek usage **φίλος** is a more objective notion than is implied by a rendering 'dear.' A φίλος is 'one of us,' not necessarily a friend or a beloved one. What is φίλον to one, belongs to one or can be reckoned as part of one's οἶκος or inner circle. See also my notes on *N.*3.7 and *P.*8.13/4 (pp. 253, 491). Thus the phrase φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν is paradoxical to a certain extent. Aegina is not so much a 'land dear to strangers' but a 'land belonging to strangers,' i.e., a land that is so hospitable that strangers may get the impression that it is theirs.

ξενία is of paramount importance for a society depending primarily on naval activity.[32] It is essential for maritime trade as a guarantee for the safety of ships and crew in foreign harbours.[33] ξενία is (like, e.g., χάρις, φιλία and αἰδώς) fundamentally at home in recipro-

---

[32] For Aegina's naval supremacy cf. Hdt.2.178, 4.152, Ephor.*FrGrHist.*70 F 176, Arist.*Pol.*1291b17ff., Paus.8.5.8, *Corpus Paroemiog. Gr.* I 268, Σ.*ad O.*8.29b; see also Winterscheidt, 51ff.; H. Michell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 19572, 236; T.J. Figueira, *Aegina*, Salem 1981, 166-70, 230ff.; H.-J. Gehrke, *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das Dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*, München 1986, 172-4; Amit, *Great and Small Poleis*, 9-16.

cal relationships.[34] Conciousness of their dependence on ξενία abroad prompted the Aeginetans emphatically to adhere to the principle with respect to foreign visitors in their own harbours. The reciprocity of ξενία makes it understandable that the Aeginetan elite emphatically pride themselves on its hospitality.[35] ξενία is one of the major themes in this ode. See interpretation, pp. 62-88.

ἄρουρα primarily means 'arable land' (e.g. ἐν cχερῶι δ' οὔτ' ὦν μέλαιναι καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι, *N.*11.39; καρποφόροις ἀρούραιcιν, *N.*6.9), but, although the specific agrarian sense is nowhere excluded, one gets the impression that already in Homer the word is used less specifically to refer to 'earth, ground, land' as the place where humans live (cf., e.g., εἰc ὅ κεν ἔλθηι | δείελοc ὀψὲ δύων, cκιάcηι δ' ἐρίβωλον ἄρουραν, *Il.*21.231/2; Ἠέλιοc δ' ἀνόρουcε...| οὐρανὸν ἐc πολύχαλκον, ἵν' ἀθανάτοιcι φαείνοι | καὶ θνητοῖcι βροτοῖcιν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν, *Od.*3.1-3). Cf. also the phrase πατρὶc ἄρουρα (*Od.*1.407, 10.29, 20.193); ἄρουραν...πατρίαν, *O.*2.14; πατρώιαν ἄρουραν, *I.*1.35 (cf. *Pae.*6.106); οἰκείαιc ἀρούραιc, *O.*12.19; ἀλλοδαπαῖc ἀρούραιc, *P.*4.255.

9-13

Of old they prayed that it (Aegina) would be noble in men and renowned in ships, when they stood by the altar of the father (Zeus) Hellenios and together spread out their hands to the sky, the famous sons of Endaïs and Phocus, the mighty prince, child of a goddess, whom Psamatheia bore where the sea-waves are breaking.

9-10. τάν ποτ' εὔανδρόν τε καὶ ναυcικλυτὰν | θέccαντο

Peleus, Telamon, and Phocus 'prayed that Aegina would be noble in men and renowned in ships.' The suggeston is that their prayer has been fulfilled. See interpretation, pp. 63, 65, 85. Aegina is famous for its shipping: cf. κλεινὰ δὲ καὶ ναυcικλυτὸc Αἴγινα, *I.*9.1; ὀνο] μακλύτα γ' ἔνεccι Δωριεῖ μ[ε]δέοιcα [πό]ντωι | νᾶcοc, *Pae.*6.123-5; ναυπρύτανιν | δαίμονα, 130/1; δολιχήρετμον Αἴγιναν πάτραν, *O.*8.20. It has even been credited the very invention of ships (Hes.*fr.*205.6/7 M.-W.). The island had poor natural resources and was therefore almost completely dependent on trade by ship.[36]

---

[33] Cf. "Pindar's emphasis ... upon the good conduct of the Aeginetans towards strangers is moreover independent testimony to the large-scale trade of the island in the first part of the fifth century", Amit, *Great and Small Poleis*, 10.

[34] Cf. D.L. Cairns, *Aidôs*, Oxford 1993, pp. 158/9, 184/5, index *s.v.* 'guest-friendship.'

[35] For a more detailed discussion see Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 324-32.

[36] Cf. Hdt.2.178, 4.152, Ephor.*FrGrHist.*70 F 176, Arist.*Pol.*1291^{b}17ff., Paus.8.5.8, *Corpus Paroemiog. Gr.* I 268, Σ.*ad O.*8.29b; the Chronicle of Eusebius, translated by Jerome, sums up: *mare optinuerant Aeginetae ann. XX usque ad transitum*

For the so-called 'relative connection' see introduction, pp. 37-41. **ποτε** serves as a signal to the audience that a shift is made from the present occasion to the past.[37] Because the audience, on hearing τάν, cannot anticipate whether the relative pronoun will merely introduce a relative clause providing background information or whether it will turn out to be the hinge between two large passages, as it is here, it is preferable to put a comma at the end of line 8.

For **εὔανδρος** cf. λοιπὸν ἔccεcθαι cτεφάνοιcί ν⟨ιν⟩ ἵπποιc τε κλυτὰν | καὶ cὺν εὐφώνοιc θαλίαιc ὀνομαcτάν. |...Φοῖβε ..., | ἐθελήcαιc ταῦτα νόωι τιθέμεν εὔανδρόν τε χώραν, *P.*1.36-40; εὐάνωρ, *O.*1.24, 6.80, 10.99, *N.*2.17, 10.36. Of the aorist **θέccαcθαι**, a rare and poetic verb, no present is found. Cf. οἱ δ' ἄρα θεccάμενοι παίδων γένοc ὅccον ἔλειπτο | ἄρcεν ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον, A.R.1.824. The Σ. *ad loc.* (p.71.6 Wendel) quotes two more parallels: θεccάμενοc γενεὴν Κλεοδαίου κυδαλίμοιο, Hes.*fr.*231 M/W; πολλὰ δ' εὐπλοκάμου πολιῆc ἁλὸc ἐν πελάγεccι | θεccάμενοι γλυκερὸν νόcτον ⏑—⏑⏑—, Archil.*fr.*8 W.

10-11. πὰρ βωμὸν πατέροc Ἑλλανίου | cτάντεc

Zeus Hellenios had a sanctuary on the Aeginetan mountain. In *Pae.*6.123-6, Aegina is called the 'shining star of Zeus Hellenios'.

The myth connected with its foundation is as follows: Aeacus was known as the most pious man of his time (Plut.*Thes.*10.3, Apollod.3.12.6, etc.). When, once upon a time, the whole of Greece suffered from drought and infertility (for opinions on the cause, see Apollod.*loc.cit.*, D.S.4.61.1/2), the Greeks sent envoys to Aeacus to request that he would intercede with Zeus to save the crops and the people.[38] Complying with their petition, Aeacus ascended the Aeginetan mountain, called on the common god, and prayed him to take pity on afflicted Greece. Even while he prayed continuous showers of rain burst out and flooded the whole land. In gratitude for this timely answer to his prayers Aeacus built the sanctuary

---

Xerxis, 17 (p. 107 Holm.). See also Winterscheidt, 51ff.; H. Michell, *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 1957², 236; T.J. Figueira, *Aegina*, Salem 1981, 166-70, 230ff.; H.-J. Gehrke, *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das Dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*, München 1986, 172-4.

[37] There are, according to Des Places, *Pronom*, pp. 48-50, 44 instances of a myth introduced by a relative pronoun. In about a quarter of this cases the relative is accompanied by ποτε (*O.*3.13, 6.12/3, *P.*1.16, 4.10, 20, 8.39, 9.5, 15, 10.31, *N.*4.25, *I.*1.13 [*Pae.*9.41, ποτέ suppl. Grenfelt-Hunt]; "La particule ποτε concourt à créer une atmosphère de légende", Des Places, p. 48). But the instances of a relative pronoun accompanied by ποτε without a myth following are numerous enough (e.g. *O.*3.29, 9.9, 10.104, *P.*3.74, 4.46 ["τόν ποτε n' introduit qu' une incidente", Des Places, p.48], 53, 107, 152, 161, 6.21).

[38] According to Pausanias (2.29.6) the portal of Aeacus' heroon, mentioned in line 53 (see comm. *ad loc.*), was decorated with a relief of the envoys. In θύεται γὰρ ἀγλαᾶc ὑπὲρ Πανελλάδοc, ἄν τε Δελφῶν | ἔθ[ν]οc εὔξατο λιμοῦ θ[, *Pae.*6.62-5, the λιμόc is taken to have reference to this occasion by Radt, *Zweiter und sechster Paian*, pp. 132/3. According to Radt the festival of the Theoxeniai had its origin in the same mythical occasion.

of Zeus Hellanios on the mountain where he prayed (Σ.*ad h.l* [III 91/2 Dr.], Σ.*ad N*.8.19a [III 142 Dr.] Isoc.9.14/5 [191d/e], Paus.1.44.9, 2.29.7/8, 2.30.3/4, Clem.Al.*Strom.* 6.3.28 [p.753], Apollod.3.12.6, D.S.4.61.1, etc.).[39]

The Altar of Zeus Hellenius is accessible via the Northern slope of the highest mountain of Aegina (now called Προφήτης Ἠλίας, or simply Ὄρος), at the end of a small dirt road, left from the 'main road' from Ἀνίτσαιο to Αἴγινα. When I went looking for it in August 1993, by moped, I found (after some trouble) a stretch of ground, levelled by means of rock blasting, thus acquiring a rectangular shape. The site is indeed remarkable. Although I was not yet on the highest point of the island by far, I had a view on the Western as well as the Eastern shore and I could see Corinth and the Megaris as well as Attica from this point. From there an impressive staircase, about 7 m. wide, mounts up to the mountain. Nowadays, the staircase ends at the stretch of level ground where the ruined little chapel of the Ταξιάρχαι is situated, just above the rectangular construction. In antiquity it must have lead upwards to a spot where there was once a large building with an interior supported by three rows of columns. This building may have been some kind of hostel. A little higher up the remains of a small *stoa* are preserved; further back are two water reservoirs. The altar itself was situated on the summit of the mountain. Some fragments have indeed been found. A little lower down, on level ground on the north side of the hill, part of a bronze hydria was found (dedicated to HEΛΛANIOIΔII) which is now in the museum of Aegina.

πατήρ is a common epithet of Zeus. There are some passages in Pindar where it is nothing more than a title, and in these cases the name Ζεύς is always explicitly mentioned (*O*.7.87, *P*.4.23, *N*.8.35, 9.31, 10.29).[40] These passages are however outnumbered by those where the literal meaning 'father' is relevant in the immediate context. In these cases the name Ζεύς is sometimes mentioned (*O*.2.27, *P*.3.98, *N*.9.53, 10.55, *I*.6.42), but—since the context gives additional information about the identity of the father by mentioning his offspring—the patronymic (*N*.10.76, *Pae*.15.5, *fr*.140a.64) or a qualification like βαρύγδουπος or μέγιστος (line 33 below, *O*.6.81, 10.45, 14.12, *I*.8.22, *Pae*.6.56) is sufficient.[41]

---

[39] In antiquity a cloud settling on the mountain was regarded as a sign of rain (Thphr.*Sign*.1.24).

[40] *Fr*.93 and 57.2 must be left out of consideration because of the lack of context.

[41] πατήρ may also qualify other deities, but never as a further unspecified title; the genealogical denotation is then always relevant (Apollo, *Pae*.9.45, in a context where he is mentioned as the father of Tenerus by Melia; Helios, *O*.7.70, mentioned as ἀκτίνων πατήρ; Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ, *O*.2.17; Cronus, *O*.2.76, πόσις Ῥέας [77], Zeus mentioned in 79).

11. πίτναν τ' ἐς αἰθέρα χεῖρας ἁμᾶ

ἁμᾶ, emphatically placed at the end of the clause, underscores the solidarity of Peleus, Telamon and Phocus. There is a strong constrast between the picture presented here and Peleus and Telamon murdering their half-brother Phocus, alluded to in the following lines. For Pindar's care for the emotive effects of variation of moods see introduction, pp. 45-7. Just like the breach of the solidarity is explicitly reprobated in the following lines, the solidarity of the three brothers is commended, both implicitly by contrast and because of the suggestion that the prayer undertaken in solidarity has been fulfilled (see preceding note and interpretation, pp. 65, 85). For the gesture, cf. ὁ δ' ἀνατείναις οὐρανῶι χεῖρας ἀμάχους | αὔδασε τοιοῦτον ἔπος·...ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, *I.*6.41/2; cf. καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἀνατείνομεν τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐχὰς ποιούμενοι, Arist.*Mu.*400ᵃ16/7.[42]

For the verb cf. πίτνας εἰς ἐμὲ χεῖρας, *Od.*11.392; *fr.*162, etc. **ἁμᾶ** (or ἁμᾶι) is regarded as the Doric form of ἅμα (see Herodian. 1.489.16-9 Lentz). Pindar uses both ἁμᾶ and ἅμᾰ, no doubt for metrical convenience. **τε** makes for a close connection. Here the two sentences connected with τ' have reference to the same action in reality: when one is praying, stretching out one's hands in the air is the action that is to be expected. The second idea, in other words, is a more concrete representation of the first idea. See also my note on τε in 14 below.

12. Ἐνδαΐδος ἀριγνῶτες υἱοὶ καὶ βία Φώκου κρέοντος

Peleus and Telamon are the sons of Aeacus and Endais. Their half-brother Phocus is the son of Aeacus and Psamatheia. Only here the subject of the preceding verbs (θέσσαντο, στάντες, πίτναν) is made explicit. Postponement of the subject of a not-uncommon procedure in Pindar, aiming at 'syntactical suspense' (cf. introduction, pp. 50/1). Here we have a relatively striking example, since, in spite of the fact that the Aeacids have been mentioned before (8), the audience have no clue whatsoever about the identity of the subject of the three verbs until it is explicitly mentioned.[43] The postponement of the subject here has the advantage that it enables Pindar to juxtapose Peleus and Telamon on the one hand and Phocus on the other at the very end of his sentence, a juxtaposition that is suggestive of the story that is alluded to in the next lines.

---

[42] See also G. Neumann, *Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst*, Berlin 1965, 78ff.; F.T. van Straten, *Babesch* 49, 1974, 161.

[43] Contrast, e.g., *P.*8.48-51, where Adrastus is mentioned as the subject of the sentence only at the very end, but where the setting of the story, in combination with ὁ δέ (48), 'the other,' helps the audience to make a correct guess about the identity of the subject before it is explicitly mentioned. See my notes, pp. 535/6.

ἀριγνῶτες is probably[44] a *hapax*. It seems plausible that it has the same meaning as ἀρίγνωτος, 'easily recognizable', 'plain to see.'[45] Here, however, connotations like 'easily known', 'well known', 'famous' seem to predominate.

The periphrasis **βία** c. gen. pers., reminiscent of epic diction (*Il.*3.105, 5.781, 22.323, etc.), is not uncommon in Pindar in heroic/mythical contexts: Οἰνομάου βίαν, *O.*1.88; Κάϲτορος βίαν, *P.*11.61; Μέμνονος βίαν, *I.*8.54; also without a proper name: ἀδελφοῦ βίαν, *N.*10.73 (Castor).

κρέων (κρείων) is used in the *Iliad* as a title, mostly of kings and chiefs, especially of Agamemnon (*Il.*1.130, etc.). Pindar uses it of Aeacus in *P.*8.99, of Zeus in *N.*3.10 (see my note, pp. 260-2), and of the Aeacids in *N.*7.45.

Epode A

13. ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὃν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου

The clause identifies Phocus as Psamathea's son. Emphasis on his maternal parentage distinguishes him from his two half-brothers, Peleus and Telamon. Psamathea is one of Nereus' fifty daughters. Her name is absent from the 'catalogue of Nereids' (*Il.*18.39-49). A sea-goddess naturally gives birth on the beach, especially if she bears this name. The reference to Phocus' place of birth is suggestive of a connection between the Aeacids and the sea, which in turn suggests a connection between the sea and Aegina, as thematized in the opening lines of this ode.

The **ῥηγμίν**, or ῥηγμίϲ (the nom. is not found), is the place where the see breaks on the shore (cf. *Il.*16.67, 20.229, E.*IT* 253, Arist.*Mete.*367^{b}14, etc.). The phrase ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάϲϲηϲ is a Homeric formula (*Il.*1.437, 8.501; nine instances in *Od.*). For the elliptical phrase **ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ**, cf., e.g., τὸν Αἰνηϲιδάμου, *O.*2.46; Ϲᾶμος ὁ 'Αλιροθίου, *O.*10.70, etc. For the lengthening of a short syllable before a ῥ (ἐπῐ), cf. *P.*1.45, *N.*8.29, *fr.*111.3, and line 50 below.

---

[44] For Simon.519 *fr.*156.2 see Poltera, *Langage de Simonide*, p. 88 (§ 63) with n. 247.

[45] Cf. οὐδ' ὅ γε Κάλχαϲ ἐϲτί ... | ἴχνια γάρ ... | ῥεῖ' ἔγνων ἀπιόντοϲ· ἀρίγνωτοι δὲ θεοί περ, *Il.*13.70-2; ⟨δώματα⟩ ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτ' ἐϲτί, καὶ ἂν παῖϲ ἡγήϲαιτο | νήπιοϲ, *Od.*6.300/1; ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτ' ἐϲτί, καὶ ἐν πολλοῖϲιν ἰδέϲθαι, 17.265; *Il.*15.490, *Od.*6.108, *P.*4.95/6, B.5.29, 9.64, 10.37, 17.57. For the prefix see Schwyzer I, 434, with n. 1; Frisk I, 138. For the accentuation see J. Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen 1969(2), 1131.

14-18

Shame prevents me from saying something big, and not hazarded according to Right: how they left the famous island, and what deity drove the valiant men from Oenona. I shall halt. It is not profitable if the whole truth displays her face unflinching. And being silent is often the wisest thing for a man to bear in mind.

14-18

The poet intrudes into his own narrative, pretending that it turned out to be unbecoming, and breaking it off. This procedure is a manifestation of the familiar fictional mimesis of ex tempore text production. On the level of this fiction, his mentioning Phocus in the preceding lines evokes on the part of the speaker the association of his having been murdered by his two half-brothers, Peleus and Telamon; the speaker shrinks back from this thought and says that he is not going on with this tale. See further introduction, pp. 36/7. For an interpretation of the relevance of the allusion to the brother murder and subsequent exile, see the interpretation, pp. 64-8, 85.

14. αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκαι τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον

'Shame prevents me from speaking out something big and something not ventured according to δίκα.' Both μέγα and ἐν δίκαι μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον refer to the crime committed by Peleus and Telamon, their murdering their half-brother Phocus,[46] which was the reason for their being exiled, as the two following dependent question clauses specify (15/6).

μή is a problem. Scholars have taken it either to signal caution on the part of the poet, or as a 'generic' μή. The former position is taken by Bury (*ad loc.*, p. 90/1: "I shrink from telling a great venture, perchance unrightly made"; "μὴ ἐν δίκαι is ventured upon in the most mild and tentative form—'peradventure, not justly' —, for this is the force of μή"), and Slater (*s.v.* μή, 3c, p. 333: "and which was perhaps unjustly undertaken"), the latter by Fennell *ad loc.* and Farnell (*ad loc.*, II, p. 276: "μή does not express doubt, but seemed the more natural negative with the participle, giving the phrase a more abstract quality, like τὸ μὴ καλόν"). Either way, Pindar's choice of μή instead of οὐ is supposed to be motivated by piety for his Aeginetan audience. But there is something illogical to this explanation. If the fear of offending the Aeginetans, by placing two of their most renowned heroes in an unfavourable light, had really been a

[46] As often, τε coordinates two expressions with one and the same reference, and typically the second expression is more specific than the first. See also my note on τ' line 11 (p. 115).

concern to Pindar, he would surely have chosen not to allude to the episode at all. This explanation fails to appreciate the fictional nature of the break off. On the level of the fiction of the extemporizing 'I' who creates his song at the very spot, the poet is struck by real horror, caused by his thoughts of a real crime. The idea of Pindar trying to spare his audience by detracting from the degree of unjustice done by the two Aeacids does not square with this fictional presentation. It confuses the fictional presentation with considerations which the poet may have had in reality.

μή has a conditional value: 'Shame prevents me from speaking out something big if it was not ventured according to δίκα.' Saying something μέγα is not in itself a reason for restraint out of shame,[47] but, if the μέγα entails a violation of δίκα, it is. The usage of μή can be compared to: ἀγαπατὰ δὲ καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαςτον | τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν δύναςθαι, *N.*8.4/5, 'sweet it is without missing the mark in any effort to be able to win the better desires,'[48] where καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα is the condition for τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν δύναςθαι to be ἀγαπατά. Cf. also: εἰ γάρ τις ἐςλὰ πέπαται μὴ cὺν μακρῶι πόνωι, *P.*8.73; οὐκ ἀξιόμαχοί εἰςι ἐμὲ ἐπιόντα ὑπομεῖναι μὴ ἐόντες ἄρθμιοι, Hdt.7.101; μὴ γὰρ τούτων δηλωθειςῶν πολλοῖς ἂν ἴςως ἄτοπος εἶναι δόξειεν, Isoc.15.1; τί γὰρ ἄν, ἔφη, χρήςαιτ' ἄν τις ἰςχυρῶι ἢ ἀνδρείωι μὴ ςώφρονι, X.*Cyr.*3.1.16; μάτην γὰρ ἥβην ὧδέ γ' ἂν κεκτήιμεθα | πολλὴν ἐν Ἄργει, μή ςε τιμωρούμενοι, E.*Heracl.*282/3, etc.

• *Literature:* On μή with the participle see further: Kühner-Gerth, II 2, pp. 198-203 (§ 513); W.F. Gallaway, *On the Use of* Μή *with the Participle in Classical Greek*, Baltimore 1897; G.E. Howes, 'The Use of Μή with the Participle, Where the Negative is Influenced by the Construction upon Which the Participle Depends', *HSCPh* 12, 1901, 277-85; A.C Moorhouse, 'On Negative Greek Participles, Where the Leading Verbs Are of a Type to Require Μή', *CQ* 42, 1948, 35-40; W. Kendrick Pritchett, 'Μή with the Participle', *AJPh* 79, 1958, 392-404.

• *Semantics:* The difference between λέγειν and **εἰπεῖν** is (at least for those forms where both stems are available as alternatives) a lexicalized difference rather than a difference in terms of aspect. λέγειν means 'to make a statement,' while εἰπεῖν means 'to speak the word.'[49] This dis-

---

[47] That μέγα εἰπεῖν is not in itself something to be disapproved of appears from: cὺν θεοῦ δὲ τύχαι | ἕτερον οὔ τινα οἶκον ἀπεφάνατο πυγμαχία ⟨πλεόνων⟩ | ταμίαν ςτεφάνων μυχῶι Ἑλλάδος ἁπάςας. ἔλπομαι | μέγα εἰπὼν ςκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν | ὥτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἱείς, *N.*6.24-8.

[48] Carey, *PCPhS* 22, 1976, 27.

[49] Thus Dr Joh. Max van Ophuijsen, quoted by Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 33.

tinction applies well to *h.l.*, for shame prevents the poet to 'speak out loud' what Peleus and Telamon have done, rather than to make a statement about this. The alternative for εἰπεῖν is silence (line 18).

εἰπεῖν is used ten times as an announcement of direct speech and four times following direct speech (Slater, *Lexicon*, p. 156, *s.v.* εἶπον, 1a and b excepting *N.*6.27); λέγειν never introduces or follows direct speech. The effect primarily intended by εἰπεῖν is hearing; λέγειν aims at understanding of meaning. Clear examples of λέγειν in this sense include: ϲύνεϲ ὅ τοι λέγω, *fr.*105a.1, which implies a possible misunderstanding of meaning, not deafness; θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖϲ Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖϲ | λέγειν ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῶι | παντᾶι κυλινδόμενον· | τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖϲ | ἀμοιβαῖϲ ἐποιχομένουϲ τίνεϲθαι. | ἔμαθε δὲ ϲαφέϲ, *P.*2.21-6, where the idea is that Ixion's example has a meaning for mortals rather than that Ixion is condemned to eternally speaking out loud the lesson he has learned. Contrast: εἰπὲ γένναν, *P.*4.100; οὔτ' ἔποϲ ἐκτράπελον κείνοιϲιν εἰπών, *P.*4.105, etc.

For **αἰδέομαι** c. inf., cf. ἔν τε θεοῖϲ κἀνθρώποιϲ ὁμῶϲ | αἰδέοντ' ἀμφανδὸν ἁδείαϲ τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶϲ, *P.*9.40/1; αἰδέομαι γὰρ | γυμνοῦϲθαι κούρηιϲιν ἐϋπλοκάμοιϲι μετελθών, *Od.*6.221; *Il.*7.93, 24.90, etc. See further Cairns, *Aidôs*, pp. 176-7. For **ἐν δίκαι**, cf. τῶν δὲ πεπραγμένων | ἐν δίκαι τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν, *O.*2.15/6; ἐν δίκαι, *O.*6.12, *P.*5.14; ἐν νόμωι, *I.*2.38; ἐν νόμοιϲ, *P.*2.43, etc.

κεκινδυνευμένον does not mean 'something put in danger,' but the meaning approaches that of κινδύνευμα, 'hazard, venture' (cf. e.g. S.*Ant.*42, *OC* 564). The closest parallel in classical Greek is καθ' ἕκαϲτον μὲν οὖν οὐ ῥάιδιον τὰ ὑπὸ πολλῶν κινδυνευθέντα ὑφ' ἑνὸϲ ῥηθῆναι...τίϲ γὰρ ἂν ἢ λόγοϲ ἢ χρόνοϲ ἢ ῥήτωρ ἱκανὸϲ γένοιτο μηνῦϲαι τὴν τῶν ἐνθάδε κειμένων ἀρετήν; Lys.2.54, where τὰ ὑπὸ πολλῶν κινδυνευθέντα obviously does not mean 'the things endangered by many', but 'the risky deeds done by many.'

The perfect thus used can only be parallelled by some rather late examples: παρεκάλει θαρρεῖν μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἤδη ϲφίϲι καλῶϲ κεκινδυνευμένων καὶ ὅτι πρὸϲ νενικημένουϲ ὁ ἀγὼν νενικηκόϲιν αὐτοῖϲ ἔϲται, Arr.*An.*2.7.3; μετὰ δὲ τὸν ταύτηϲ θάνατον Νινύαϲ ὁ Νίνου καὶ Cεμιράμιδοϲ υἱὸϲ παραλαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἦρχεν εἰρηνικῶϲ, τὸ φιλοπόλεμον καὶ κεκινδυνευμένον τῆϲ μητρὸϲ οὐδαμῶϲ ζηλώϲαϲ, D.S.2.21.1; οὕτω δὲ παράβολον ἐπιτελεϲάμενοϲ πρᾶξιν, ἄλλην ἐτόλμηϲε ταύτηϲ μᾶλλον κεκινδυνευμένην, 20.7.1; ἀναδιδάϲκει ἡμᾶϲ πῶϲ ἄν τιϲ ἀϲφαλῶϲ κεκινδυνευμέναϲ τε καὶ τραγικὰϲ ἐννοίαϲ μεταχειρίϲαιτο, Philostrat.*Vit.Soph.*2.585; οἱ παγκρατιάζοντεϲ, ὦ παῖ, κεκινδυνευμένηι προϲχρῶνται τῆι πάληι· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖϲ ὑπωπιαϲμῶν τε, οἳ μή εἰϲιν ἀϲφαλεῖϲ τῶι παλαίοντι, καὶ ϲυμπλοκῶν, Philostrat. *Imagines* 2.6.3.

The medio-passive perfect of the compound παρακινδυνεύω is more common in this sense (Ar.*Ran.*99, Clem.Al.*Protr.*7.74.2, D.H.9.30.1, D.H.*Lys.*13, *Is.*13, *Comp.*23, *Pomp.*2.16, Eus.*PE* 14.5.14, Eust. *Il.* II 413.7, *Od.* I 349.32, Joh.Chrysostomos, *In Joannem* 59.140, *In acta* 60.305, *In*

*Dan.proph.*56.238, Lucian*Alex.*32, Origenes *Cels.*6.44, Philo Jud.*Rer.di.*21, *Somn.*2.37, Pl.*Lg.*752b5, Plut.*Caes.*9.3, Synesius *Dion* 3, 14).

15-16

Pindar alludes to Phocus' violent death. There are many versions of this story.[50] But there seems to be a *consensus* in the tradition that both Phocus' half-brothers, Peleus and Telamon, were held responsible for his death and were subsequently compelled to leave Aegina. Telamon fled to Salamis, Peleus to Phthia.

15. δή

The particle δή in questions is a signal indicating that the speaker supposes his addresse to be aware of the fact that the question is, given the circumstances, a very evident or logical question to ask.

*N.*10.76 is an illustrative exemple: Idas fatally wounds Castor and Polydeuces, effected by the sudden death of his beloved brother, calls upon Zeus: "Πάτερ Κρονίων, τίς δὴ λύσις | ἔσσεται πενθέων;" *N.*10.76/7, 'Father, you must understand that these circumstances give rise to one pressing question: What release shall there be from these sorrows?' It is a logical question to ask and δή explicitly marks it as such. In τίς δὴ ποταίνιον | ἔλαχε στέφανον | χείρεσσι ποσίν τε καὶ ἅρματι, | ἀγώνιον ἐν δόξαι θέμενος εὖχος ἔργωι καθελών; *O.*10.60/3, the question as to the identity of the victors in the first Olympic games is a logical question to ask after the story about Heracles founding the festival and its vicories (55-9).

Here δή gives a slightly ironical twist to the question. Pindar realizes that it is a logical question to ask, how it could occur that Peleus and Telamon left Aegina (or, in other words, the beginning of the myth, mentioning Peleus and Telamon, as well as Phocus, suggests this continuation). But still he is not going to answer it.

For δή in questions, see Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 65/6. For δή in general see *ibid.*, pp. 52/3; Van Ophuijsen, *ibid.*, pp. 80-8, 140-51. The discussion of δή by Hummel, *Syntaxe*, 404/5 (§ 515), is less helpful.

15. ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους

ἄλκιμος adds to the surprising character of the occasion. The δαίμων did not just expel two insignificant men from Aegina; they were ready and able, fighting men. The absence of the article also fits in this picture. Pindar does not say that the δαίμων expelled *these* brave

---

[50] Sources disagree about the murder-weapon and about the motif. Different accounts are to be found in: Paus.2.29.9/10, D.S.4.72.6/7, Σ.*ad h.l.*, Σ.*ad* E.*Andr.*687, Apollod.3.12.6, Tzetz.*Lycophr.*174, I 444, 447 Müller, Lactantius Placidus on Stat.*Theb.*2.113, Dorotheus quoted by Plut.*Vit.Parall.*25.

men, but he formulates it in a more general way: 'ready and able men.'

16. Οἰνώνας

Oenona was the original name of the island Aegina. It was renamed after the nymph Aegina when she had given birth to Aeacus on it.

Cf. *N.*8.6-8, *N.*4.45/6, Hdt.8.46, Apollod.3.12.6. Cf. also Str.7.6.16, Hyginus, *Fab.*52 (see comm. *ad N.*3.13 Μυρμιδόνες). Another old name for Aegina was Οἰνωπία, cf. *I.*8.23-5; Ov.*Met.*7.472 ff.

16. στάσομαι

Cf. ἀφίσταμαι, *O.*1.52. There is a contrast with 19-21. When the subject is unbecoming, Pindar 'stands still'; when on the contrary he is in a situation that he has to sing about laudable deeds, he fulfills his task more than wilfully. See also Becker, *Bild des Weges*, p. 73/4.

•*Future:* στάσομαι is in Bundy's list (I, p. 21) of 'encomiastic' futures that "refer to the present." However, first person futures in Pindar may refer to a later moment during the performance of the ode. They are then used as announcements on the part of the poet as to what he is going to do subsequently in the ode.[51] Thus the future may be used as a "metanarrative tense that refers neither to the time of the telling nor to that of the tale, but to what Genette[52] calls 'the space of the discourse'." Futures may be "temporal indications that are referential only to the linear disposition of the discourse,"[53] the moment that is called 'now' meaning 'at this point in the performance,' while the future functions as a textual sequencer and as a text articulating device, providing the audience an orientation as to what they may expect.[54] στάσομαι (16), 'I shall halt,' equivalent to 'I shall not go on,' is the negative counterpart of first person futures announcing a theme that the poet is going to deal with later on in the course of the performance of the ode. The future makes clear that the theme of fratricide will not be adressed in the remainder of the performance. Thus the future is comparable to: οὔ νιν διώξω, *O.*3.45; διασωπάσομαί οἱ μόρον ἐγώ, *O.*13.91; παρήσομες, Alcm.*fr.*1.12; ἀλλ' οὐδὲν γὰρ μέγα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλο ἔργον ἐγένετο βασιλεύσαντος δυῶν

---

[51] This category concurs with Pelliccia's "programmatic intra-carminal futures" (*Mind, Body and Speech*, pp. 320, 322-5). For the question as to whether or not Bundy, Slater, and Fogelmark are tacitly allowing for this type of futurity in some cases, see Pelliccia, p. 320, with nn. 78 and 79.

[52] Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, Ithaca 1980 (translation by J.E. Lewin of 'Discours du récit', a portion of *Figures III*, Paris 1972).

[53] Suzanne Fleischman, *Tense and Narrativity. From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (*Croom Helm Romance Linguistics Series*), London 1990, p. 40.

[54] Obvious examples of this type of future include *P.*2.62, *P.*4.67, *O.*13.3, *P.*5.108.

δέοντα τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεα, τοῦτον μὲν παρήσομαι τοσαῦτα ἐπιμνησθέντες, Ἄρδυος δὲ τοῦ Φύγην βασιλεύσαντος μνήμην ποιήσομαι, Hdt.1.14/5; τὰς δὲ μὴ ἀξίας λόγου παρήσω, X.*HG* 4.8.1, etc. For more details see my *First Person Futures in Pindar.*

16-17. οὔ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων | φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκές 'It is not profitable when the whole truth displays her precise face'. This is the first of the two gnomic statements which, on the level of the extemporizing fiction, serve as a justification for not telling the story about fratricide. φαίνοισα πρόσωπον involves a personification of ἀλάθεια. See interpretation, pp. 67/8. For κέρδος in a similar context cf. ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν· ἀφίσταμαι· | ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους, *O.*1.52/3. The meaning 'profit' may be relevant in this and our passage, to the extent that "the poet must show prudence in his selection of material, lest his patrons refuse to pay him" (Cairns, *Aidôs,* p. 177).

• *Text:* The mss. have ἀτρεκής. The mss. of Stob.3.11.16 (p. 432 Hense), where lines 16-8 are quoted in a compilation of citations about ἀλήθεια, have ἀτρεκές. The scholion 30a (III p. 93 Dr.) in ms. B reads ἀτρεκής, whereas the same scholion in D has ἀτρεκές. The two readings may be regarded as ancient variants. ἀτρεκές is preferable for three reasons. First, ἀτρεκές goes better with the personification of ἀλάθεια. ἀτρεκής as a qualification of ἀλάθεια would give the noun an abstract character which would spoil the personification achieved by πρόσωπον. Second, because ἀτρεκής is by far more common as a qualification of notions like ἀλάθεια than of parts of a body,[55] it is clearly the *lectio facilior.* Third, ἅπασα, κερδίων, and φαίνοισα are governed by ἀλάθεια and it would be awkward to add an extra qualification to this complex at the rear, whereas adding ἀτρεκές as a qualification of πρόσωπον, that is embedded in between φαίνοισα and ἀλάθεια, corresponds with a common pattern (cf., e.g., ἁβρὰ Κρηθεΐς Ἱππολύτα...|...ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπὸν | πείσαις' ἀκοίταν, 26-8; μελιγαρύων τέκτονες | κώμων νεανίαι, *N.*3.4/5, etc.).

• *Pindar's Attitude towards Truth:* Poetry has a reputation for being at odds with the truth (cf. the claim of Hesiod's Muses: ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, Hes.*Th.*27),[56] or, as the proverb said, πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί (see West's testimonia to Sol.*fr.*29; A.

---

[55] For *N.*3.41/2, see my note, pp. 332/3.

[56] See West *ad loc.*; P. Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*, Baltimore 1977, 8-44; W. Stroh, 'Hesiods lügende Musen', *Studien zum antiken Epos* (H. Görgemanns & E.A. Schmidt, edd.), Meisenheim am Glan 1976, 85-112; Walsh, *Varieties of Enchantment*, pp. 23-36.

Masaracchia, *Solone*, Firenze 1958, 330-4).[57] Pindar is concious of the fact that poetry has the power to make the unbelievable believable (*O.*1.28-34). As a poet who praises the accomplishments of athletes, he may be felt to be vulnerable to the temptation to violate the truth to a relatively great extent, since a victor is likely to feel flattered if the poet exaggerated his deeds (as, for Pindar, Homer exaggerated Odysseus' prowess: ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι | λόγον 'Οδυccέοc ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἁδυεπῆ γενέcθ' Ὅμηρον· | ἐπεὶ ψεύδεcί οἱ ποτανᾶι μαχανᾶι | cεμνὸν ἔπεcτί τι· cοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοιcα μύθοιc, *N.*7.20-3). Pindar's repeated claim that he does not yield to this temptation and that in his odes there is only place for the truth is in keeping with his *ethos* of an impartial herald of the victor's accomplishments, and serves the encomiastic aims of his poetry in quite a direct way. Cf., e.g., ἀρχὰ μεγάλαc ἀρετᾶc, ὦναcc' 'Αλάθεια, μὴ πταίcηιc ἐμὰν | cύνθεcιν τραχεῖ ποτὶ ψεύδει, *fr.*205; μελιγάρυεc ὕμνοι | ὑcτέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων | τέλλεται καὶ πιcτὸν ὅρκιον μεγάλαιc ἀρεταῖc, *O.*11.4-6; αὐδάcομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόωι, *O.*2.92 (cf. also *O.*13.98-100, where the herals's cry at the games is a 'true statement on oath'), etc. He expresses this thought metaphorically by comparing his words with arrows or javelins hitting the bull's eye (ἔλπομαι | μέγα εἰπὼν cκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν | ὥτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἱείc, *N.*6.26-8; *O.*2.83-95; *O.*13.93-100). Cf. also B.13.204-7, 9.85-7. Although this *gnome* fits nicely in the drift of Pindar's argument here (on the level of the extemporizing fiction), the statement that displaying the whole truth is not always profitable is surprising in the light of the encomiastic poet's claims to truth.

• *Semantics:* Pindar uses **πρόcωπον** exclusively in a figurative way, as a metaphor for outward appearance, for what strikes the eye. In γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόραc | ἀργυρωθεῖcαι πρόcωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί, *I.*2.7/8, the embellishing effect of dance upon the outward appearance of song is expressed by the image that 'songs are besilvered as to their faces by Terpsichora'; in χρυcέαc ὑποcτάcαντεc εὐτειχεῖ προθύρωι θαλάμου | κίοναc ὡc ὅτε θαητὸν μέγαρον | πάξομεν· ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόcωπον | χρὴ θέμεν τηλαυγέc, *O.*6.1-4, outward appearance,

[57] Or, as Batavus Droogstoppel (coffee agent) puts it in Multatuli's *Max Havelaar, of De koffieveilingen der Nederlandsche Handel-Maatschappij:* 'Ik heb niets tegen verzen op zichzelf. Wil men de woorden in 't gelid zetten, goed! Maar zeg niets wat niet waar is. "De lucht is guur, en 't is vier uur." Dit laat ik gelden, als het werkelijk guur en vier uur is. Maar als 't kwartier voor drieën is, kan ik, die mijn woorden niet in 't gelid zet, zeggen: "de lucht is guur en 't is kwartier voor drieën." De verzenmaker is door de *guurheid* van den eerste regel aan een vol uur gebonden. Het moet voor hem juist een, twee uur, enz. wezen, of de lucht mag niet guur zijn. Zeven en negen is verboden door de maat. Daar gaat hij dan aan 't knoeien! Of het weer moet veranderd, òf de tijd. Eén van beide is dan gelogen.'

viz. the façade of a building as well as the prelude to an ode, is circumscribed by πρόcωπον; in φάει δὲ πρόcωπον ἐν καθαρῶι I...νίκαν I...ἀπαγγελεῖ, *P.*6.14-8, πρόcωπον refers to the façade of a ὕμνων θηcαυρόc (7/8).

For **ἀτρεκής**, 'precise, exact,' cf. καιρῶι cὺν ἀτρεκεῖ, *P.*8.7 (with my note, pp. 476/7); πάντα μάλ' ἀτρεκέωc ἀγορευέμεν, ὡc ἐπιτέλλω, *Il.*2.10; δεκὰc ἀτρεκέc, *Od.*16.245, etc. Precision may have connotations of truth: cf. πότερον δίκαι τεῖχοc ὕψιον I ἢ cκολιαῖc ἀπάταιc ἀναβαίνει I ἐπιχθόνιον γένοc ἀνδρῶν, I δίχα μοι νόοc ἀτρέκειαν εἰπεῖν, *fr.*213; μαθεῖν...τὴν ἀτρεκείην, ὅτι οὐκ αἱρέει τὸ Ἄργοc, Hdt.6.82; πάντωc κου τὸ ἀτρεκέcτατον πυθόμενοι, Hdt.7.214; 1.209, 4.152, 5.9, etc. In Pindar the noun and the adjective may have the connotation 'exactly just, righteous' (νέμει γὰρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν Ζεφυρίων, *O.*10.13; ἀτρεκὴc Ἑλλανοδίκαc, *O.*3.12). For **κερδίων**, 'more advantageous, more useful,' cf. *Il.*6.410/1, *Il.*3.39-42, S.*Aj.*743/4. Cf. also ἐνόηcεν, I ὅππωc κέρδοc ἔηι, *Il.*10.224/5, etc. The (masc.)/fem. form occurs only *h.l.* and at Eustatius, *Comm.Od.* I 244.16: τῆc κερδίονοc κρίcεωc.

τοι has a strongly interactive character. By means of τοι the speaker calls upon the special attention of his addressee. It has, therefore, affinity with statements that are in a way surprising (for a more extensive discussion of this particle in Pindar see my note on line 48 below, pp. 611-3). Here τοι signals an awareness on the part of the speaker that his statement that truth does not always have highest priority may for his addressee come as a surprise. Moreover, it signals the element of paradox in describing ἀλάθεια in terms of a virtuous matron who must not unveal her face in public: obviously, ἀλάθεια normally is associated with the notion of *not* covering up, *not* concealing.

• *Literature:* On Pindar and truth see: Bowra, *Pindar*, 26-33; L. Woodbury, 'Truth and the Song', *Phoenix* 23, 1969, 331-5 (with references in n. 10); A. Ortega, 'Poesía y verdad en Pindaro', *Helmantica* 21, 1970, 253-72; A.M. Komornicka, 'Quelques remarques sur la notion d' ἀλάθεια et de ψεῦδοc chez Pindare', *Eos* 60, 1972, 235-53; U. Hölscher, 'Pindar und die Wahrheit', *Wandlungen. Studien zur antiken und neueren Kunst*, Waldsassen 1975, 90-102; D. Bremer, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Bonn 1976, 161, 296-314; Maehler on B.3.96 (p. 61); Burnett, *Art of Bacchylides*, pp. 44/5, 57-9; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 100-6; Walsh, *Varieties of Enchantment*, pp. 37-61. On ἀλήθεια in general: M. Detienne, *Les Maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*, Paris 1967; B. Snell, ''Ἀλήθεια', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* NF 1, 1975, 9-17; further references are to be found therein (p. 9 n. 1). On personification in Pindar see: Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, pp. 141-4; Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, esp. pp. 551-7; Gerber on *O.*1.34 (pp. 68/9) and on *O.*1.81 (pp. 124/5, 126/7); James J. Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification*, Cambridge 1994; L. Petersen, *Zur Geschichte der Personifikation in griechischer Dichtung und bildender Kunst*, Würzburg 1939; T.B.L. Webster, 'Personification as a Mode of Greek Thought', *JWS* 17, 1954, 10-21.

18. καὶ τὸ cιγᾶν πολλάκιc ἐcτὶ cοφώτατον ἀνθρώπωι νοῆcαι 'And being silent is often the wisest thing for a man to keep in mind'. **καί** introduces the second of the two gnomic statements which, on the level of the extemporizing fiction, serve as a justification for the poet's passing over the fratricide, as an extension of the first justification. Within the context of the argument, **τὸ cιγᾶν** refers to the poet's (fictional) reticence; **πολλάκιc** includes occasions like we have here, where the poet of an ode for a festive occasion is confronted with disreputable material.

For the thought cf. μὴ πρὸc ἅπανταc ἀναρρῆξαι τὸν ἀχρεῖον λόγον· | ἔcθ' ὅτε πιcτόταται cιγᾶc ὁδοί· κέντρον δὲ μάχαc ὁ κρατιcτεύων λόγοc, *fr.*180; τὸ δὲ μὴ Δί | φίλτερον cιγῶιμι πάμπαν, *fr.*81, both lacking context. In *I.*1.63 the statement ἦ μὰν πολλάκι καὶ τὸ cεcωπαμένον εὐθυμίαν μείζω φέρει serves as a justification of a break-off of the type 'too much to tell' (60-3). The same is true for *I.*5.51, where ἀλλ' ὅμωc καύχαμα κατάβρεχε cιγᾶι breaks off a passage where Aegina is praised (34-50) and effects the transition to the praise of the victor (54-63).[58] Contrast passages like: ἔcτι δέ τιc λόγοc ἀνθρώπων, τετελεcμένον ἐcλὸν | μὴ χαμαὶ cιγᾶι καλύψαι· θεcπεcία δ' ἐπέων καύχαc ἀοιδὰ πρόcφοροc, *N.*9.6/7; cιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν ἔργωι φυγών, *P.*9.92; θνάιcκει δὲ cιγαθὲν[59] καλὸν ἔργον, *fr.*121.4. These passages have reference to the poet's obligation to immortalize noble deeds, such as the victors.'

The addition of the epexegetical infinitive[60] **νοῆcαι** at the end of the sentence is puzzling. It seems that the statement would have been complete and clear enough without it. However, this in itself, especially as the verb is placed in the marked position at the end of the sentence, gives the verb emphasis. νοέω means 'taking cognizance of something,' covering the process of perceiving something, grasping and understanding it, and drawing conclusions on it so as to undertake some action.[61] For Pindar the connotations of 'intending' predominate: εἰ δὲ καcιγνήτου πέρι | μάρναcαι, πάντων δὲ νοεῖc ἀποδάccαcθαι ἴcον, κτλ, *N.*10.85/6; [ὁ δ]' ἐχθρ̣ὰ̣ νοήcαιc | ἤδη φθόνο̣c

[58] For diplomatic silence in Homer cf. *Il.*10.533ff., *Od.*4.138ff.; see Adkins, *CQ* 22, 1972, 44.

[59] Barnes: δ' ἐπιταθὲν codd.

[60] For a superlative with epexegetic infinitive cf. τοῦτο δ' ἀμάχανον εὑρεῖν, | ὅτι νῦν ἐν καὶ τελευτᾶι φέρτατον ἀνδρὶ τυχεῖν, *O.*7.25/6; *O.*13.47/8 (cited below), etc.

[61] Thus H. Fränkel *ad* A.R.3.7 (p. 329): "νόοc heißt nicht 'Auge', und νοῆcαι bezeichnet nie ein bloßes 'Wahrnehmen', sondern 'zur Kenntnis nehmen', das geistige Erfassen der vorliegenden Situation, o.ä.; ein homerisches ὀξὺ νόηcεν führt immer zu einem aktiven Eingriff."

οἴχεται τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων, *Pae.*2.54-6; thus also ἕπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάςτωι | μέτρον· νοῆcαι δὲ καιρὸc ἄριcτοc, *O.*13.47/8, where the gnomes are part of a transitional passage, motivating a 'break off' of the type 'too much to tell,' following a lengthy victory catalogue. μέτρον has reference to the 'full measure' of praise, implying the idea 'more is too much.' The following assertion, then, about καιρόc being best to 'intend,' specifies that, in this context, the limit implied by μέτρον ties in with effectiveness in the present circumstance and announces that, from this point onward, the poet's compositional plans will be in keeping with καιρόc (see also my note on *P.*8.7, pp. 647-53). Thus νοῆcαι seems to define cοφώτατον as related to one's assessment of the situation at hand and one's intentions based on this assessment. νοῆcαι conveys the idea of silence being the best 'policy.'

For the article with the infinitive (not in Homer), in Pindar always in the nominative (except perhaps *O.*2.97),[62] cf. *O.*2.51, 9.37, *P.*1.99, *N.*8.44. With present tense stem forms only here and at *O.*9.38, *P.*2.56. It has been observed that there is a tendency for the construction to occur in sentence initial position (contrast *O.*8.59/60). See further: F. Birklein, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs*, I, Würzburg 1888; B.L. Gildersleeve, 'Contributions to the History of the Articular Infinitive', *TAPhA* 9, 1878, 1-11; *Syntax of Classical Greek*, I, pp. 132-6 (§§ 313-26); Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 343/4 (§ 343); J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I, Basel 1920, 271.

Strophe B

19-21

If it has been decided (for me) to praise wealth, or strength of hands or iron-clad war,—let someone dig a pit for me for long jumps from here. I have a light spring in my knees. And eagles dart across the sea.

19-21

In line 19, after the fictional skipping of the story of Peleus and Telamon murdering their half-brother Phocus (14-8), three examples are given of subjects that are laudable, fit the festive occasion, and that do rouse Pindar's enthusiam as a poet of *epinicia*: 'happiness', 'strength of hands', and 'iron-clad war.' For the relevance of these themes see the interpretation, pp. 68/9. For the continuity in the imagery, see the interpretation, p. 70, and compare *N.*3.26-32,

---

[62] The first occurences of oblique forms are: Ion 26.10; A.*PV* 681; for further examples see Kühner-Gerth, II, 2, pp. 40 ff.

where Pindar calls himself back from a digression he pretends to be irrelevant and makes a transition to the praise of local Aeginetan heroes, and does so by concentrating on the location where both stories are set, calling himself back from Gibraltar to Aegina. See my note, p. 302.

19. εἰ δ'

The εἰ clause introduces the positive program after the break-off and its motivation. As the positive program is presented as objectively given (cf. the perfect δεδόκηται), the εἰ clause, as often, introduces an idea that is not a condition in a logical sense; it makes for discontinuity and it opens a new domain, a new frame-work for what is to follow. Cf. εἰ δέ τοι | μάτρωι μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύεις | στάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν κτλ, *N.*4.79-81. See further my note on *N.*3.19 (pp. 282/3); cf. also line 50 below with my note (p. 180).

19. ὄλβον

ὄλβος is the state of bliss that is a result of realizing one's ideals.[63] Thus a man may have ὄλβος as a result of a victory at the Great Games (*N.*8.17), for this will make him famous (cf. *O.*7.10). Someone having ὄλβος can be contrasted with a χαμηλὰ πνέων, a humble man who remains unknown (ἄφαντον βρέμει, *P.*11.29). Dead ancestors have ὄλβος as a result of a victory of their offspring (*P.*5.102). Wealth is a condition for ὄλβος: Arcesilaus has πολὺς ὄλβος, for he is a king, he has a γέρας, consisting of great cities, and on top of all that he has won in the chariot race (*P.*5.14). Chromius has θαυμαστὸν ὄλβον, for on top of his many possessions (ἅμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς) he has a glorious prestige (ἐπίδοξον ἄρηται κῦδος, *N.*9.45). The combination of wealth (δαπάνα), success in the Games (πόνωι πράσσει θεοδματοὺς ἀρετάς) and fame (δόξαν ἐπήρατον) is the utmost ὄλβος (*I.*6.10-3). For Pindar ὄλβος is something that is given to men by the gods (*O.*2.21/2, 36, *N.*7.58/9, 9.45) and that attends to them for a while (*O.*6.72, *P.*3.106, 5.14, 55, *I.*3.6), but there is always a danger of losing it (*O.*6.97, *P.*3.105/6, 12.28-30,[64] *fr.*134). At the best it 'abides longer' (*N.*8.17, cf. *P.*11.52, *I.*3.5). Only gods may have permanent

---

[63] The evidence in Pindar supports the conclusions of C. de Heer, *Μάκαρ, Εὐδαίμων, Ὄλβιος, Εὐτυχής: A Study of the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the End of the 5th Century B.C.*, Diss. Utrecht, Amsterdam 1969, 99/100, who states: "εὐδαίμων is connected most intimately with the sense-component of permanence; the condition of being ὄλβιος is an aspect, a manifestation, of being εὐδαίμων, while εὐτυχής is the momentary aspect, the moment when a man rises above others in achievement without being aware of any special merit to which this achievement may be due. ... Ὄλβιος is the visible manifestation of εὐδαίμων; when being ὄλβιος is achieved, it is the result of being εὐτυχής."

[64] See my note in *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 410-2.

ὄλβος. Zeus is ὁ ὄλβωι φέρτατος (*N.*10.13).[65] Heroes have ὄλβος—not necessarily a more permanent version than mortals—when they are allowed to share in the gods' good lifes. Tantalus had ὄλβος when the gods attended his dinners (*O.*1.56). Ixion once had a γλυκὺν βίοτον among the gods, which was μακρὸς ὄλβος (*P.*2.26). Peleus and Cadmus acquired ὄλβος ὑπέρτατος, because the Muses came to sing at their wedding when they married a goddess; and the gods were at their feasts giving them presents (*P.*3.89). Heracles has κάλλιστος ὄλβος, for he lives among the gods, he is honoured as their friend, he has the most beautiful wife, he lives in golden houses and he is Hera's son in law (*I.*4.58).

19. χειρῶν βίαν

χειρῶν βίαν ἐπαινῆσαι is an apt description of performing a victory ode for a pancratiast. βία is the physical strength essential to compete in the Games successfully (cf., e.g., ἔν τ' ἀέθλοισιν ἀριστεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν, *N.*11.14), especially in disciplines like the pancration. For the phrase cf. πρόσθε χειρῶν βίαν | δε[ί]ξομεν· τὰ δ' ἐπίοντα δα[ίμω]ν κρινεῖ, B.17.45/6 (cf. also ἀλλά νιν αἰχμοφόροι μύθοισί τε μειλιχίοις καὶ βίαι χειρῶν κάτεχον, B.11.89-91). Pindar often refers to the victor's discipline by mentioning the part of the body, hand or foot, which is characteristic for that discipline.

Cf. τίς δὴ ποταίνιον ἔλαχε στέφανον χείρεσσι ποσίν τε καὶ ἅρματι; *O.*10.62; σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶσαι σθένει, *N.*10.48; χερσὶ νικάσαντ', *I.*5.9; ὃς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήσαις | τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἕληι τόλμαι τε καὶ σθένει, *P.*10.23/4; αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν...| χερσὶ δέξιον, νόωι ἀντίπαλον, *I.*5.59-61; παῖδ' ἐρατὸν ⟨δ'⟩ Ἀρχεστράτου | αἴνησα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾶι, *O.*10.100. Cf. also δεῦρ' ἄγε καὶ σύ, ξεῖνε πάτερ, πείρησαι ἀέθλων, | εἴ τινά που δεδάηκας· ἔοικε δέ σ' ἴδμεν ἀέθλους. | οὐ μὲν γὰρ μεῖζον κλέος ἀνέρος, ὄφρα κεν ἦισιν, | ἤ ὅ τι ποσσίν τε ῥέξηι καὶ χερσὶν ἑῆισιν, *Od.*8.145-8.

19. σιδαρίταν...πόλεμον

In war and at the Games a man can prove his prowess and distinguish himself. Cf. νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοις | ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου | τιμώμενος, *O.*2.43-5; νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράσος | δεινῶν πολέμων, ὅθεν φαμὶ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, *P.*2.63/4, etc. For the relevance of war as a theme for this ode see interpretation, pp. 66-88.

[65] Alternatively ὁ δ' ὄλβωι φέρτατος may refer to Amphitryon, with the ὁ δέ signalling *topic shift*, as Prof. Miller suggested to me in a personal letter. In fact, there may be deliberate polyinterpretability here, which would be functional in the light of the fact that the whole point of the story is that Zeus and Amphitryon cannot be told apart (15-7).

War may be called 'iron-clad' because the weapons used for it may be made of iron (cf. also ὑπὸ cτερεῶι πυρί Ι πλαγαῖc τε cιδάρου, *O.*10.37; cιδήρεοc ὀρυμαγδόc, *Il.*17.424; Th.1.6). Elsewhere epithets are used that associate war with bronze: πολέμου...χαλκεντέοc, *N.*1.16; χαλκοχάρμαν ἐc πόλεμον, *I.*6.27; πολέμου τε καὶ χαλκεοκτύπου μάχαc, B.18.58.

19. δεδόκηται

The impersonal perfect presents the three positive themes for this ode as objectively given: 'it is decided'[66] rather than 'it seems good to me, it is my intention.' The three subject matters do not represent Pindar's own personal choice, but are given by the occasion. For the subject-matter being presented as something objective and given (as ordered by Pindar's commisioner), cf. εἰ δέ τοι Ι μάτρωι μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύειc Ι cτάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν κτλ, *N.*4.79-81.

For the perfect cf. δεδογμέν', ὡc ἔοικε, τήνδε κατθανεῖν, S.*Ant.*576; τοῦτο μὲν δέδοκται, πίνειν ὅcον ἂν ἕκαcτοc βούληται, ἐπάναγκεc δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι, Pl.*Smp.*176e; εἰ δέ τοι οὕτω δεδόκηται[67] γίνεcθαι, Hdt.7.16γ; γινομένηc δὲ φυγῆc τῶν ἐναντίων ἐδέδοκτο τὴν ἄγκυραν ἀναλαβόντα οὕτω διώκειν, 9.74; Hdt.3.85, 8.100, S.*Tr.*719, *El.*1049, E.*IA* 1375, etc.

19-20. μακρά μοι Ι αὐτόθεν ἅλμαθ' ὑποcκάπτοι τιc

'Let someone dig a pit for me for long jumps from here,' an image borrowed from the long jump[68], one of the five events of the pentathlon. Pindar skips an unsavoury episode from the history of the house of Aeacus and picks up the thread of the story in a different place on a later moment: Peleus' most glorious moment, when he married a goddes on Mount Pelion in Thessaly in the presence of the gods. The *suppressed tenor* of the imagery in this and the following line is an announcement of this thematic manoeuvre ('I make a long jump' meaning 'I skip an episode and pick up the thread somewhere else'). As will become especially clear in 21 where the jump from the first to the second episode is described in terms of crossing the sea, the description of the poet's thematic conduct ties in with the geographical settings of both episodes: not only does the poet 'jump' from one episode to another, he also makes a very long jump from Aegina to Thessaly; this gives **μακρά** is full relevance. **αὐτόθεν** is deictic (cf. *N.*3.64 with my note, pp. 369/70). It refers both to 'this point in the ode' (perparing for a transition from the unfit episode

---

[66] εἰ δέ τοι ἐπαινέcαι δεῖ κτλ, Σ. 34a (III, 93 Dr.). Cf. Sicking & Stork, *Semantics of the Verb*, pp. 139-41.

[67] δέδοκται P.

[68] Greeks did not practice the high jump.

that is passed over in silence to a more positive episode) and to Aegina, the place that is called 'here' in the context of the performence, which formed the setting of the earlier episode.

ὑποσκάπτω means 'to dig under,' as in: τρέφειν δὲ δοκεῖ καὶ ὁ κονιορτὸς ἔνια καὶ θάλλειν ποιεῖν οἷον τὸν βότρυν, δι' ὃ καὶ ὑποκονίουσι πολλάκις· οἱ δὲ καὶ τὰς συκᾶς ὑποσκάπτουσιν ἔνθα τούτου δεῖ, Thphr.*HP* 2.7.5 (cf. the metaphorical usage in Eratosth. *ap.* Ath.13.588a: μή τι τοιοῦτοι ὑμεῖς οἱ φιλόσοφοι...οἱ καὶ πρὸ τῶν Ἡδονικῶν καλουμένων αὐτοὶ τὸν τῆς ἡδονῆς τοῖχον ὑποσκάπτοντες). Here the reference is to the loosening up of the soil so as to make a 'garden' in which a long jumper can land. The optative can only be desiderative. As it has been noted by Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, 57, a wish (e.g. *O.*9.80-3), prayer (e.g. *N.*8.35/6, *P.*1.29, *N.*9.28), or self-exhortation (*O.*9.35/6; 13.94, *P.*1.81, 3.61/2, 10.51, *I.*5.51) is a common feature in break-off passages. For the indefinite/generic τις in a directive phrase, cf. *N.*9.50, *I.*5.54, *I.*8.1; cf. also *fr.*190, *I.*8.66, *Pae.*1.2.

• *The Long Jump:* A jumper took off from the βατήρ (*AB* 224) and landed in the ground dug up and sanded for the purpose, which in Greek is called τὸ σκάμμα (Σ.*ad h.l.*, *AB* 224), τὰ ἐσκαμμένα (Pl.*Crat.*413a, Luc.*Gall.*6),[69] ὄρυγμα (Σ.*ad* Pl.*loc.cit.*), βόθρος (Σ.*ad h.l.*) or τάφρος (Σ.*ad* Pl.*loc.cit.*). So the σκάμμα is soft and the athlete leaves an impression where he lands (cf. οὐ γὰρ συγχοροῦσι οἱ νόμοι διαμετρεῖν τὸ πήδημα ἢν μὴ ἀρτίως ἔχῃ τοῦ ἴχνους, Philostr.*Gymn.*55; this is exactly what the second sentence of the scholion *ad h.l.* refers to: ἡ δὲ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν πεντάθλων, οἷς σκάμματα σκάπτονται, ὅταν ἅλλωνται· ἐκείνων γὰρ κατὰ τὸν ἀγῶνα πηδώντων, ὑποσκάπτεται βόθρος ἑκάστου τὸ ἅλμα δεικνύς, Σ.34b [III 94 Dr.]). A controversial epigram survives about Phayllus, who made such a marvellous jump (πέντ' ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα πόδας πήδησε Φάυλλος, *AP* App.297, almost twice the distance of what we reckon to be the world record), that he jumped over the garden, landed on the hard ground and broke his leg (Φάυλλος...ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐσκαμμένους πεντήκοντα πόδας εἰς τὸ στερεὸν ἥλατο, Zenobius 6.23; *Suda s.v.* ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα πηδᾶν). The expression ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα became proverbial (Pl.*Crat.*413a, Lib.*Or.*64.69; Luc.*Gall.*6). See further: E.N. Gardiner, 'Phayllus and his Record Jump', *JHS* 24, 1904, 70-80; 'Further Notes on the Greek Jump', *ibid.* 179-194; *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London 1910, 295-312; W.W. Hyde, 'The Pentathlon Jump', *AJPh* 59, 1938, 405-17; F. Mezö, 'Das Rätsel des altgriechischen Weitsprungs', *Das Altertum* 6, 1958, 165-172; H.A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, London 1964, 80-5; I. Weiler, *Der Sport bei den Völkern der alten Welt*, Darmstadt 1981, 157-161, with further references.

---

[69] Gardiner, *JHS* 24, 1904, 70-3, demonstrated that there is no difference between τὸ σκάμμα and τὰ ἐσκαμμένα (*pace* Bury *ad h.l.* and LSJ *s.v.* σκάπτω).

20. ἔχω γονάτων ὁρμὰν ἐλαφράν

'I have a light spring in my knees.'[70] On the level of the *vehicle*, this claim serves as an explanation of the preceding announcement of a very long jump: Pindar has the ability[71] to do so. Consequently, on the level of the *suppressed tenor*, the sentence represents the proud claim on the part of the poet that his thematic flexibility will allow of effecting major transitions without effort. The asyndeton leaves the explicative status of this sentence in the light of the preceding one to the interpretation of the audience (cf. introduction, p. 27).

A **ὁρμά** is an (often rapid and compelling) motion forwards; cf. ἵππων ὁρμή, Thgn.986, ἔγχεος ὁρμή, [Hes.]*Sc.*365, 456; πάντες μιᾶι ὁρμῆι προσεκύνησαν τὸν θεόν, X.*An.*3.2.9. From the context it is clear that a long jump is meant. In ἐν Ποσειδᾶνος περικλειτοῖς ἀέθλοις | [ἀνίκ' ἄμφαν]ας Ἕλλασιν ποδῶν ταχεῖαν ὁρμάν, B.10.19/20 and in σύντειν'—ὥρα—ποδὸς ὁρμάν, E.*El.*112 (127), the reference is to running. For **ἐλαφρός** cf. ἐλαφρὸν ὄρχημ' οἶδα ποδῶν μειγνύμεν, *fr.*107b.1; τοὺς δὲ παλαιοτέρους, ὧν οὐκέτι γούνατ' ἐλαφρά, Tyrt.*fr.el.*10.20 W.

• *Text:* The mss. reading ἔξω is an old corruption (Σ. 34b, III 93 Dr., paraphrases ἐπὶ τὸ ἐξώτερον). With the uniformization of the Greek alphabet in the fourth century B.C., some peculiarities of the western alphabet disappeared, notably the symbols + for *kh* and X for *ks*. The corruption can be explained as a hypercorrection of a scribe who was used to find X for *ks* (which he had to transcribe as Ξ), and 'corrected' (the already normalized) ΕΧΩ to ΕΞΩ under the influence of the following genitive γονάτων. See Irigoin, *Histoire du texte*, p. 23; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 154 n. 4.

21. καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί

'And eagles dart across the sea.' This line contains a general[72] statement about the capacity of eagles. The generic character of the statement accounts for the plural αἰετοί. The statement is in itself fully comprehensible, but it has, on a literal level, nothing to do with the context in which it occurs. So, in accordance with Grice's 'cooperative principle,'[73] the hearer is led to assume that the statement

---

[70] ὁρμὰν ἐλαφράν in Turyn's *metri gratia* emendation for the mss. reading ἐλαφρὰν ὁρμάν. E. Schmid proposed ἐλαφρὸν ὁρμάν (cf. Maas, *Greek Metre*, pp. 40/1); but elsewhere in str. 2 there is e fixed word end before the third syllable from the end as well as a bridge between the syllables preceding this fixed word end (... ⏔— | ⏑ — — ||).

[71] The usage of ἔχω here, with a noun denoting an action as object, resembles the combination of ἔχω with an infinitive (e.g. ἔχω καλά τε φράσαι, *O.*13.11; *P.*2.57, *N.*7.56, *I.*5.47). See also my note on *N.*3.41, p. 330.

[72] The alliteration lends the line an almost proverbial ring. On alliteration as a characteristic feature of proverbs see Silk, *Poetic Imagery*, pp. 224/5; further references are to be found therein.

[73] 'Logic and Conversation', *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (P. Cole & J.L. Morgan, edd.), New York 1975, 41-58. The 'cooperative principle' entails that

about eagles is meant by the poet to be a statement about something else. The first person reference to the poet in lines 19 and 20, combined with the fact that line 21, like line 20, expresses the idea of covering a distance, strongly argues in favor of applying the image of the eagle to the poet.[74] The fact that line 21 begins with **καί** indicates that the content of the following statement is an extension of the preceding one; καί indicates that we stay in the same context.[75] And, as often, the second statement is more precise than the first one: the poet travels long distances, i.e., he crosses the sea.[76] This can be interpreted literally as mirroring the transition from the site of the first episode of the myth on Aegina (8, 16) to Thessaly, where the second episode occurs (22). The poet flies across the sea and the scene switches from Aegina to Thessaly. Stoneman's argument (*CQ* 26, 1976, 195) for applying the image to the victor, with the conclusion that it is the victor's fame that 'flies even across the sea', fails to appreciate the way in which the image is embedded in the context as a transition from the first episode of the myth to the second.[77]

The image of the eagles here applies solely to the poet. The context steers the hearer to the interpretation that the statement about

---

the hearer will always assume that what the speaker says makes sense. See also my *CPh* 89, 1994, 306/7.

[74] This is what Bernadini calls "l' accostamento più naturale e logico tra il balzo compiuto dal poeta e il volo transmarino" (p. 125)—although I think one cannot speak of "compiuto" until line 22.

[75] Both statements, ἔχω γονάτων ὁρμὰν ἐλαφράν and πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί, are coordinated by καί because they express the same thought; they give a motivation for μακρά μοι | αὐτόθεν ἅλματ' ὑποσκάπτοι τις, giving assurance of the poets ability to do so. καί here cannot be taken adverbially (thus Stoneman, *CQ* n.s. 26, 1976, 195); we lack a signal for that. Since there is no alternative particle available, a listener will naturally interpret καί as connecting this sentence to the preceding one.

[76] The general statement about the capacity of eagles is therefore in effect precisely the opposite of "a *generalized* extension of the long leap which the poet is about to take" (my italics), as is assumed by Hubbard (p. 152). The distance that has to be covered (as implied by the Greek words μακρὰ ἅλματα and ὁρμὰν ἐλαφράν) is specified as πέραν πόντοιο.

[77] Stoneman (*CQ* 26, 1976, 195) is well aware of the fact that the verses preceding the image of the eagle contain statements about Pindar's poetic qualities and that it is unnatural not to relate the imagery to them. He therefore proposes the following construction: it is the victor who is compared to an eagle, but "Pindar is using the victor's greatness as a paratactic simile for the excellence of his own art". Apart from being very far-fetched, the Greek text does not provide any evidence for this interpretation. Hubbard (*Pindaric Mind*, p. 152) wants to interpret the image of the eagle here as expressing an ideal of preeminence encompassing both poet and victor (and the Aeacids in general). However, his observation "that the soaring archievements of the *laudandi* (both the victor and the Aeacids) are what necessitates the poet's long leap" fails to recognize the function of this passage as a transition from the first episode of the myth to the second. Moreover, Hubbard's argument is entirely based upon the word "soaring" in his own text.

the eagles is meant by the poet to be a statement about himself.[78] The association activated by the context is that eagles, like the poet, have the ability to cover great distances and to do so without effort (cf. ἐλαφράν, 20). The purpose of the image may be that Pindar associates himself with the more general associations of the notion 'eagle', not directly evoked by the context, namely associations of merit and superiority.[79] For the other occurences of the eagle image (*O.*2.86-8, *N.*3.80-2, *P.*5.111/2, B.5.16-30) see my *CPh* 89, 1994, 305-17. For *N.*3.80-2 see also below (pp. 221-3).

The denotation of active, transitive **πάλλω** is 'to shake, toss' (cf. κλήρους ἐν κυνέηι χαλκήρεϊ πάλλον, *Il.*3.316; πέλτας θ' ὅσοι πάλλουσι, E.*Ba.*783; [Hes.]*Sc.*321). As it is often used to refer to the swaying of a missile before it is thrown (αἰχμῆς ..., ἣν ἄρ' Ἀχιλλεὺς | πάλλεν δεξιτερῆι φρονέων κακὸν Ἕκτορι δίωι, | εἰσορόων χρόα καλόν, ὅπηι εἴξειε μάλιστα, *Il.*22.319-21; cf. 3.19, 5.304, 16.142, etc.), it can be understood that Pindar metaphorically uses the verb in the sense of 'to throw' a missile (χερσὶ θαμινὰ | βραχυσίδαρον ἄκοντα πάλλων ἴσα τ' ἀνέμοις, | μάχαι λεόντεσσιν ἀγροτέροις ἔπρασσεν φόνον, *N.*3.44-6, see my note, p. 342). The rare instances of the intrasitive active are in keeping with this metaphorical sense, in that they refer to a rapid motion forwards without any swaying or quivering being implied (ὁ φίλαυλος ἔπαλλε δελφίς, E.*El.*435; ἄορι δ' ἐν φονίωι τετραβάμενος ἵπποι ἔπαλλον, *ibid.*476/7; cf. Ar.*Lys.*1304). The medio-passive means 'to quiver' (as in γόνυ πάλλεται γερόντων, Ar.*Ra.*345), often with the connotation 'in fear' (e.g. ἐν δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῆι στήθεσι πάλλεται ἦτορ, *Il.*22.452; cf. A.*Ch.*410; παλλομένη κραδίην, *Il.*22.461; δείματι παλλόμεναι, *h.Cer.*293, Orac. *ap.* Hdt.7.140, etc.). However, Pindar

---

[78] One might argue that insofar as the Aeacids, like the poet, have crossed the sea (15/6) and the poet's leap in fact is in pursuit of theirs, this could be a reason for applying the image of the eagles to the object of praise, i.e. to the Aeacids, as well. However, the specific context in which the image occurs is crucial to the interpretation of its relevance. The image here occurs in a transitional passage, in which the poet himself makes first person statements about his way of handling transitions in subject matter. The statement about the eagles is formally characterized by means of καί (21) as an extension and amplification of these first person statements. So the context unambiguously guides the hearer to apply the image to the poet,—in spite of its being on factual grounds applicable to the Aeacids as well.

[79] It is probably more than a coincidence that Pindar hints at his superiority over his rivals in the encomiastic trade in the context of a transitional passage following a break off passage entailing the fictional mimesis of ex tempore speech. It is especially this technique, enabling Pindar to combine variegated material in a natural way, that sets him off from his rival Bacchylides (cf. introduction p. 45). The metaphor πάλλοντ', which attributes directional effectiveness to Pindar's way of handling thematic transitions (see below), betrays the poet's awareness of the effectiveness of this technique.

uses the medio-passive of this verb exclusively in a metaphorical way, as the passive of the metaphorically used transitive active (*N.*3.45, *v.s.*), in the sense 'being thrown, like a missile' without any quivering or fear being implied.[80] This also applies to the only other instance[81] of the medio-passive of this verb in Pindar: πέτεται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάccαc τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐc Αἰθίοπαc | Μέμνονοc οὐκ ἀπονοcτήcαντοc ἔπαλτο, *N.*6.48-50 (cf. also cθρεφθεὶc γὰρ μετόπιcθεν ἐν ἀcπίδοc ἄντυγι πάλτο, *Il.*15.645).

Thus we are dealing with a 'mixed metaphor.' Pindar metaphorically calls himself an eagle (the *suppressed tenor* is 'I'), the *ground* being that he as a poet has the ability to cover great distances thematically, like the eagle has the ability to cross the sea without effort. Within this metaphor, so to speak, the flight of the eagle is metaphorically described by the verb πάλλοντ'. The *suppressed tenor* is, in other words, a verb meaning 'flying.' The *vehicle* πάλλοντ', borrowed from the terminology of swaying missiles, stands for the *suppressed tenor* 'fly,' the *ground* being that both eagles and missiles travel with great speed through the air. The *target* of this metaphor is that directional effectiveness is attributed to the flight of the eagle and consequently to Pindar's way of handling thematic transitions, in a way quite similar to passages where Pindar uses bow or javilin imagery in order to suggest that his words 'hit' his subject matter as javelins and arrows hit their target, i.e., that he presents his subject matter in exactly the right way (cf., e.g., ἔλπομαι | μέγα εἰπὼν cκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν | ὥτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἱείc, *N.*6.26-8; *O.*2.83, 89/90, 13.93-5). After having broken off an episode of the story of Peleus as being unfit to relate, Pindar suggests that with his next theme he will 'score a bull's eye,' in other words, that his next theme will be an excellent theme to deal with and that he will deal with it in exactly the right way.

22-25

For those men also willingly the loveliest choir of Muses sang on Mount Pelion. In their midst Apollo chased his seven-tongued phorminx with his golden quill and led songs in every kind.

The Muses sang for the Aeacids, represented by Peleus, on Mount Pelion, at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. ὡc in 26 introduces a

---

[80] Note that in none of the three occurrances of this verb in Pindar the reference is to a vibrating or throbbing movement.

[81] In *O.*13.72: ἀνὰ δ' επαλτ ὀρθῶι ποδί, it is preferable to accentuate ἐπᾶλτ' rather than ἔπαλτ'.

story about Peleus and Hippolyta as a subject matter of the Muses' song. The preceding break-off is still central to Pindar's rhetoric. The poet (on the level of the fictional mimesis of ex tempore speech) almost started to tell us an ugly story unfit for a festive occasion. He was just in time to check himself and to steer his ode in a different direction. Now the poet's and audience's main concern is whether the next story the poet selects will be a nice and fitting one. But we can be reassured: the Peleus and Hippolyta story (Pindar's new subject matter) once was the subject of a song of the Muses, which (on the level of this fictional rhetoric) guarantees that this next story will not be out of place as a subject for this ode. See further interpretation, p. 71.

22-23. πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοις ἄειδ' ἐν Παλίωι | Μοιcᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός

This sentence, introducing the narrative setting of the 'frame-story,' reflects the poet's (fictional) rhetorical purpose of emphasizing the appropriateness of the Peleus and Hippolyta story which is to follow as a subject matter for his ode. The function of **καί** in line 22 has often been misunderstood. Its position seems to suggest that it throws its force exclusively on κείνοις. However, as κείνοις must refer to 'those men I spoke about earlier', i.e. the Aeacids,[82] this would entail that there is another implied audience, which is not the case.[83] καί in line 22 must belong to the whole sentence ('it is also the case that the Muses willingly sang for them that...'),[84] underscoring

[82] Stoneman (p. 195) adopts Bury's suggestion (*The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890), pp. 85/6, 92) that the referent of κείνοις in line 22 is αἰετοί in line 21, the eagle being a symbol of the Aeacids. But if we reject Bury's symbolism, which is based on the phonetic resemblance between αἰετός and Αἰακός, the image of Muses singing for eagles is absurd. κεῖνος is often used to refer to a person who has not been mentioned for a long time (e.g. κεῖνον in *O.*1.101, referring to Hieron, last mentioned in line 23; see Des Places, *Pronom*, pp. 67/8).

[83] The suggestion made by Staffan Fogelmark, 'καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22', in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M.W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edd. G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, M.C.J. Putnam (Berlin & New York, 1979), pp. 71-80, following Dissen, Fennell, and Cerrato, that καί in καὶ κείνοις implies an allusion to the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia, who like Peleus and Thetis heard the Muses sing at their wedding ('the Muses sang also for the Aeacids', *sc.* as they did for Cadmus and Harmonia, cf. *P.*3.86-95), is needlessly fanciful. Neither Cadmus nor Harmonia are mentioned in this ode, and an allusion to their wedding has no function at all in it.

[84] An illustrative example of this is: ἀνίσταντο οἱ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτομάτου ... οἱ δὲ καὶ ὑπ' ἐκείνου ἐγκέλευστοι, X.*An.*1.3.13. For Pindar cf.: τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῶι διπλόα θάλλοις' ἀρετά, | Φυλακίδ', ἄγκειται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν | Πυθέαι τε, παγκρατίου, *I.*5.17-9 ('At the Isthmus a double victory is planted for you and thrives; this is also the case at Nemea for both of you, [one for you] and [one] for your brother'); ἦ θαύματα πολλά· καί πού τι καὶ βροτῶν | φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον | δεδαιδαλμένοι

the parallelism between the willingness of the Muses to sing about the story of Peleus and Hippolyta and Pindar's own willingness to do so. The placement of πρόφρων, in the marked position directly before δέ, emphasizes the Muses' willingness as a parallel to Pindar's own enthusiasm (19-21). **κάλλιστος** derives its relevance from the poet's (fictional) rhetorical purpose of emphasizing the excellence of his next subject matter: of course the Muses form the most beautiful chorus one can imagine; stressing this aims at underscoring the fact that the Peleus and Hippolyta story is on the repertoire of the best band in the world.

The choice of imperfect **ἄειδ'** (instead of the aorist) mirrors the informational status of the verb: it lacks *focus*-function.[85] The issue is not that the Muses were *singing;* the sentence conveys that it were the *Muses* who were singing and that they did so *willingly.* Thus both πρόφρων and Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός have *focus*-function in a higher degree than ἄειδ'. Note that Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός has been placed at the very end of the sentence, a position typically reserved for the most salient part of the statement as far as information status is concerned.

For **πρόφρων** 'willing,' cf. αἰεί τοι φίλον ἐστὶν ἐμεῦ ἀπονόσφιν ἐόντα | κρυπτάδια φρονέοντα δικαζέμεν· οὐδέ τί πώ μοι | πρόφρων τέτληκας εἰπεῖν ἔπος, ὅττι νοήσῃς, *Il.*1.541-3; τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον | ἄγε σὺν Τιρυνθίοισι πρόφρονα σύμμαχον ἐς Τροΐαν (*sc.* Τελαμῶνα Ἡρακλέης), *I.*6.27/8. When the 'willingness' is very resolute, connotations of 'eager' or 'zealous' may predominate (as in προφρονέως μάχεσθαι, *Il.*5.810). πρόφρων may connote kindliness, often with the implication that the attitude of the person being πρόφρων is advantageous for someone else. Cf. προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν, κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων | καὶ Μελίσσῳ, *I.*4.43/4, Pindar wishes to find the Muses πρόφρονες, because if they are the quality of his song and subsequently the fame of Melissus are secured (40-2); θεός τέ οἱ τὸ νῦν τε πρόφρων τελεῖ δύνασιν, *P.*5.117, by allowing Arcesilaus his victory; Λιβύα | δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμασιν ἐν χρυσέοις | πρόφρων· ἵνα οἱ χθονὸς αἶσαν | αὐτίκα συντελέθειν ἔννομον δωρήσεται, *P.*9.56/7; καί ῥά οἱ | μάντις ὀρνίχεσσι καὶ κλάροισι θεοπροπέων ἱεροῖς |

ψεύδεσιν ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι, *O.*1.28/9 ('and [καί], I suppose [που], to some extent [τι] it is also the case that [καί] what people say ...'). Cf. also *Od.*21.29, Hdt.1.201 (final sentence), etc. See further W.J. Verdenius, 'Καί Belonging to a Whole Clause', *Mnemosyne* 29, 1976, 181.

[85] See Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 27-33. Cf. also the convenient overview in his *Semantics of the Verb*, pp. 74-9. Here we have an example of the relevance of what Sicking calls "the information function of the *verb form* as such within the clause or sentence it is part of" (as opposed to "the information function of the ... *clause* involved [in which the verb form is the predicate] within its context," p. 77). Contrast ἀγεῖτο, line 25 below.

Μόψος ἄμβαςε cτρατὸν πρόφρων, *P.*4.189-91, because the omens were favourable.[86]

Mount Pelion is situated in the eastern part of Thessaly, called Magnesia (cf. line 27), about twelve kilometers north-east of Iolcus at the Pagasaean Bay. There, outside Cheiron's cave,[87] the wedding of Peleus and Thetis was celebrated (E.*IA* 701-7). The Olympians attended, seated on twelve thrones. The Muses and Apollo provided the music. All the gods bestowed the young couple with magnificent gifts (*P.*3.84-96, *Il.*16.143-51, 18.82-5, 24.534-7, E.*IA* 1036-79; Apollod.3.13.5; *Cypria* quoted by Σ.*ad I.*16.140).

23. ἐν δὲ μέcαιc

Sc. Μοίcαιc. Here, on the level of text organization, ἐν δὲ μέcαιc effects a *topic-shift.* The phrase 'in their midst' signals that someone else is going to be the *topic* of the following statement. This appears to be Apollo, who remains *topic* until with αἱ δέ in 25 the *topic* shifts back to the Muses.

Cf., e.g., Ἀργέιοι δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἐκαρτύναντο φάλαγγαc.| ἀρτύνθη δὲ μάχη, cτὰν δ' ἀντίοι· ἐν δ' Ἀγαμέμνων | πρῶτοc ὄρουc', ἔθελεν δὲ πολὺ προμάχεcθαι ἁπάντων, *Il.*11.215-7. When the poet is talking about the two armies and then proceeds 'and in their midst' (ἐν δ'), it is perfectly clear that the armies cease to be the *topic*; the new topic is then identified immediately. For the phrase cf. *P.*9.119, *I.*8.31, *P.*4.224 (with Braswell *ad loc.*, p. 310, cf. pp. 402/3).

24. φόρμιγγ'...ἑπτάγλωccον

A φόρμιγξ is a type of lyre. See further my note on *N.*3.12 (pp. 264-6). The *phorminx* is 'seven-tongued'[88] because it has seven strings.

Originally the *phorminx* seems to have been a primitive, four-stringed kind of *lyra* or *kithara*; the four-stringed instruments on vase paintings[89] are generally identified as *phorminges* (see also West, *Ancient Greek Music*, pp. 52/3). According to the tradition Terpander was responsible for the extension of the number of strings from four to seven (Strab.13.2.4; cf. Cleonid.*Harm.*12; but see Steinmayer, p. 192, 113-5; West, p. 330. See also *CQ* 21, 1971, 307-9; *JHS* 101, 1981, 113/4, 116; *ZPE* 73, 1986, 44-6. Cf. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer*, pp. 89/90, 355). For the number seven, cf. ἑπτακτύπου | φόρμιγγοc, *P.*2.70/1; ἑπτὰ δὲ cυμφώνουc ὀΐων ἐτανύccατο χορδάc, *h.Merc.*51; πολλά cε μουcοπόλοι | μέλψουcι καθ' ἑπτάτονόν τε

---

[86] Thus Braswell *ad loc.*

[87] For Cheiron's cave cf. *N.*3.43, 53/4 (with my notes, pp. 337, 353), *P.*3.1-5, 63, *P.*4.102, *P.*9.5, 30, etc. See also Bömer on Ov.*Fast.*5.379.

[88] ἑπτάγλωccοc is a *hapax.* For a similar coinage cf. ἀδύγλωccοc βοὰ κάρυκοc ἐcλοῦ, *O.*13.100.

[89] E.g. on the Dipylon-vase in Tübingen (B4; Watzinger, *Tübinger Vase* 11, Taf. 1 B4) and on a Dipylon-cantharos in Copenhagen (*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum Copenhague*, Nat. Mus. Taf. 73.3 and 6).

ὀρείαν ǀ χέλυν ἔν τε κλέοντες ὕμνοις, E.*Alc.*445-7; cf. also *HF* 683, *Ion* 881. The *barbitos*, a variation of the *lyra* with a lower range of pitch, has also seven strings: ὦ βάρβιτε, μηκέτι πάσσαλον φυλάσ[σων] ǀ ἑπτάτονον λ[ι]γυρὰν κάππαυε γᾶρυν, B.*fr.*20B (27) 1/2. There is some literary evidence, as well as evidence from vase-paintings, that from the middle of the fifth century the number of strings was increased even more (see West, pp. 62-4). Cf. also Ion *fr.*32 W.

In Homer the *phorminx* was often heard at weddings, as it is here: e.g., on Achilles' shield (*Il.*18.495). After he has killed the suitors Odysseus asks Phemius to play the *phorminx* in order that the passers-by may think that the noise has been due to a wedding (*Od.*23.133-6). In *Il.*24.63 Apollo plays, like *h.l.*, his *phorminx* at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis.

24. Ἀπόλλων

The *phorminx* is associated with Apollo as well as the Muses.

Cf. χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων ǀ σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον, *P.*1.1/2; *P.*4.176/7, *Il.*1.603/4, [Hes.]*Sc.*203/4, Ar.*Av.*217-9, etc.

24. χρυσέῳ πλάκτρῳ διώκων

Apollo 'chased his seven-tongued phorminx with his golden plectrum.' The normal expression for 'touching' the strings with a plectrum (the *suppressed tenor*) is κρούειν (Pl.*Lys.*209b with Σ.*ad loc.*, see also Steinmayer, pp. 94/5), and later κρέκειν (Diog.Ath.1.10, D.H.7.72). By using **διώκων** instead Pindar visualizes Apollo's virtuosity (διώκειν δέ φησιν αὐτόν, τὸ τάχος ἐμφῆναι βουλόμενος τῆς πλήξεως, Σ.*ad h.l.*). Cf. αἴλινον μὲν ἐπ' εὐτυχεῖ ǀ μολπᾷ Φοῖβος ἰαχεῖ ǀ τὰν καλλίφθογγον κιθάραν ǀ ἐλαύνων πλήκτρῳ χρυσέῳ, E.*HF* 348-51.[90]

A **πλᾶκτρον** (~ πλήσσω) is a 'pick,' a little stick, with one end in the shape of a leaf or heart, made of horn (Pl.*Lg.*795a), wood (*IG* 2^2.1388.80), or metal (gold like *h.l.*, cf. τοῖο δὲ φόρμιγξ ǀ χρυσέου ὑπὸ πλήκτρου καναχὴν ἔχει ἱμερόεσσαν, *h.Ap.*183/4; E.*HF* 348-51, quoted in the next note; Hor.*C.*2.13.26/7, 4.3.17/8), used to twang the *phorminx*, *barbitos*, and *lyra*.

[90] The phrases καμπύλον μέλος διώκων, *fr.*107a3, and [σέθ]εν Ἰαωονι τόνδε λαῶι [παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω ǀ Δη]ρηνὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πάρ τ' Ἀφρο[δίταν], *Pae.*2.3-5, cannot be compared, for there the *vehicle* διώκων/διώξω is borrowed from the vocabulary of chariot-driving (A.*Pers.*84, Hdt.7.140, cf. *P.*9.4, B.9.44; cf. καμπύλον, which is an epithet for chariots [*I.*4.29, *Il.*5.231]) and by means of this *vehicle* the *tenor* (μέλος/παιᾶνα) is compared to a chariot, which is a common Pindaric (and Bacchylidean) metaphor (*O.*9.81, *P.*10.65, *I.*2.2, 8.61, B.5.176/7; cf. *O.*6.22). For a more extensive discussion see Radt, *Zweiter u. Sechster Paian*, 26/7.

Cf. πλήκτρωι ἐπειρήτιζε κατὰ μέλος,[91] ἡ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς | cμερδαλέον κονάβηcε, *h.Merc.*53/4. In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* no πλῆκτρον is mentioned. According to the tradition the plectrum was invented by Sappho (*Suid. s.v.* Σαπφώ, Σ.107, IV 323.10 Adler; cf. Sapph.*fr.*99.5 L.-P.) or Hermes (Apollod.3.10.2). Vase paintings showing a plectrum include: a *scyphus* by the Pistoxenos-painter, Schwerin 708; a *hydria* by Phintias, München 2421; an amphore by the Andocides-painter, Paris Louvre G1; a plate by Brygos, Würzburg L479; an amphore by the Berlin-painter, Berlin 2160. Fragments of ivory plectra have been found at Mycenae and Mendi (Bronze Age) and Sparta (Archaic), see M. Maas & J. McIntosh Snyder, *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece*, New Haven & London 1989, 8, 37, 48, fig. 13d. For a more extensive discussion of the playing technique of lyres, see West, *Ancient Greek Music*, 64-70.

χρυcόc symbolizes an association with the divine. Cf. *O.*1.87, *O.*2.72, *O.*7.34, *P.*3.9/10, *P.*3.94, *P.*9.6, *N.*10.88, *I.*4.60. Apollo's intrument is made of gold in *P.*1.1/2, Hes.*Sc.*203, Simon.*fr.*511(1)a.5 Page, *h.Ap.*184/5. See further: Duchemin, *Poète et prophète*, pp. 193-228; *REG* 65, 1952, 46-58; Kollmann on *P.*1.1 (pp. 39/40); H.L. Lorimer, 'Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology', *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to G. Murray*, Oxford 1936, pp. 14 ff. For χρύcεοc as an epithet for goddesses see my note on line 7 above (p. 109).

ANTISTROPHE B

25. ἀγεῖτο παντοίων νόμων

Apollon Musagète 'led songs in every kind,' including, as will become clear, a song about Peleus and Thetis and about Peleus and Hippolyta. For **ἀγέομαι** in this sense, cf. αὐτὰρ θεῖοc ἀοιδὸc ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν | ἡμῖν ἡγείcθω φιλοπαίγμονοc ὀρχηθμοῖο, *Od.*23.133/4; αὐλητῶν ἀνθρώποιc ἡγουμένων ᾠδῆc, Pl.*Alc.*1.125c/d; cὸν περὶ βωμὸν ἐγειρομένου κιθαριcμοῦ | κύκλιον ὠρχήcαντο, χοροῦ δ' ἡγήcατο Θηcεύc, Call.*Del.*312/3; ὁ δὲ Κῦροc...τοῦ χοροῦ ἡγήcατο Πέρcαιc, X.*Cyr.*8.7.1;[92] cf. also πολλοῖcι δ' ἄγημαι cοφίαc ἑτέροιc, *P.*4.248, where, however, the verb seems to continue the preceding image of the journey (cf. Braswell *ad loc.*, p. 341). The choice of the imperfect here reflects the information status of the statement as a whole: the sentence about Apollo leading the songs supplies back-ground information to the main argument, which is that the Muses sung about

---

[91] μέροc codd., but cf. 501/2.

[92] ἡγεῖcθαι χοροῦ "may imply the initiation, the organisation and the actual leading of the choir," Mineur on Call.*Del.*313 (p. 243), with a reference to Cl. Calame, *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* I, Rome 1977, p. 115.

Peleus and Hippolyta on the occasion of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis.[93]

νόμος as a musical *terminus technicus* refers to "a specific nameable melody, or a composition in its melodic aspect, sung or played in a formal setting in which it was conventionally appropriate" (West, *Ancient Greek Music*, p. 216). Our sources seem to suggest that a specific νόμος defined a specific melodic program for an instrumental[94] solo performance with a strongly mimetic character. An example is the πολυκέφαλος νόμος, the auletic repertoire piece with which Midas of Acragas won the Pythian contest in 490, a victory immortalized by *P.*12; this νόμος involved mimesis of the hissing serpents that grew from the Gorgon Euryale's head, lamenting over the killing of her sister Medusa by Perseus (*P.*12.6-25).[95] It is difficult to determine exactly how strictly defined the musical form was. "We certainly get the impression that 'he played the nome of Athena' would have conveyed more precise information than 'he played a mazurka.' On the other hand it seems likely that it was rather less precise than 'he played Chopin's opus 30 no. 1'." (West, *Ancient Greek Music*, p. 217).[96]

Poets tend to use the noun in a non-technical way, of any melody with a definite identity or character.[97]

---

[93] Cf. Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 22-5. Cf. also the convenient overview in his *Semantics of the Verb*, pp. 74-9. Here we have an example of the relevance of what Sicking calls "the information function of the...*clause* involved (in which the verb form is the predicate) within its context" (as opposed to "the information function of the *verb form* as such within the clause or sentence it is part of," p. 77). Contrast ἄειδ', line 22 above.

[94] In Hdt.1.24.5 Arion seems to *sing* the ὄρθιος νόμος to the accompaniment of his lyre. Cf. also Pl.*Lg.*700b. For the ὄρθιος νόμος cf. Ar.*Eq.*1279, Ps.-Plut.*Mus*1132c/d, Pollux 4.65.

[95] Cf. Σ. *ad loc.*, Ps.-Plut.*Mus.*7 (1133d/e), Pratinas *fr.*713 *PMG*, Aristox.*fr.*80, Nonn.*D.*24.35-8. See further Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, pp. 144/5; West, *Ancient Greek Music*, p. 214 with n. 56.

[96] From a passage from Ps.-Plutarch's treatise on music: οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν τὸ παλαιὸν οὕτω ποιεῖσθαι τὰς κιθαρωιδίας ὡς νῦν, οὐδὲ μεταφέρειν τὰς ἁρμονίας καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμούς· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς νόμοις ἑκάστωι διετήρουν τὴν οἰκείαν τάσιν· διὸ καὶ ταύτην ἐπωνυμίαν εἶχον· νόμοι γὰρ προσηγορεύθησαν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐξῆν παραβῆναι καθ' ἕκαστον νενομισμένον εἶδος τῆς τάσεως, *Mus.*6 (1133b/c), it can be concluded that the νόμος defines the ἁρμονία, the rhythm, the οἰκεία τάσις (perhaps the key-note), and the εἶδος τῆς τάσεως. However, some scepticism is called for, as Barker (*v.i.*) observes: "Many of them [late antique treatises on the subject] —perhaps most— represent hopeful interpretations of unsystematic poetical allusions, rather than a deliberate archaic scheme of classification", concluding that though νόμος means what ancient sources say it does, that is, a type of solo composition whose style was restricted by rules, "what the rules were, and what forms of composition correspond to them, the historians for the most part did not know, and neither do we."

[97] Cf. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, p. 215.

Cf. ϝοῖδα δ' ὀρνίχων νόμως πάντων, Alcm.*fr.*40 *PMG*; νόμων ἀκούοντες θεόδματον κέλαδον, *fr.*35c. Cf. also A.*Supp.*69, *Ag.*1142, 1153, *Cho.*424, 822, *Pr.*575, S.*fr.*245, 463, 861, E.*Hec.*685, *Hel.*188, Telestes *PGM* 810.3. In ἐμὲ δὲ cτεφανῶcαι | κεῖνον ἱππίωι νόμωι | Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾶι | χρή, *O.*1.100-3, the option of Pindar referring to a fixed, known ἵππιοc νόμοc is rendered implausible by the fact that he refers to his own ode, currently sung. It is a 'horse-song', a 'horseman's ode,' because Hieron had been victorious in the horse-race.[98] The association with the technical sense of νόμοc (evoked by the fact that the νόμοc has a name and by the other technical musical term following) conveys the (fictional) suggestion that Pindar's ode will turn out to be the first specimen of a new νόμοc, which can be taken as an assurance to the victor that the ode in which he is immortalized will see many re-enactments.

Here the possibility of Apollo taking the lead in all kinds of set repertoire pieces cannot be excluded with absolute certainty; however, the fact that we have a singing chorus here instead of an instrumental solo performance renders this possibility improbable and strongly pleads in favour of taking νόμοc in its less specific sense of 'song' here. Associations with the technical sense of νόμοc (if evoked here at all) could be taken to underscore the mimetic quality of the Muses' song.

• *Literature:* On νόμοc as a musical term see further: A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. 1, Cambridge 1984, 249-257; T.J. Fleming, *CJ* 72, 1977, 222-33; H. Grieser, *Nomos: ein Beitrag zur griechischen Musikgeschichte*, Leipzig & Borna 1937; E. Laroche, *Histoire de la racine nem– en grec ancien*, Paris 1949, 166-71; F. Lasserre, *Plutarque de la musique. Texte, traduction, commentaire, précédés d' une étude sur l' éducation musicale dans la Grèce antique*, Olten & Lausanne 1954; H. Koller, 'Das kitharodische Prooimion. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *Philologus* 100, 1956, 182-7; S. Michaelides, *The Music of Ancient Greece, An Encylopaedia*, London 1978, 222/3; Nagy, *Pindar's Homer*, pp. 87-91; A.J. Neubecker, *Altgriechische Musik. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1977, 44-6; Steinmayer, pp. 137-40; W. Vetter, *RE* 17.840-3; West, *Ancient Greek Music*, 212-7.

25-31

First they sang, beginning with Zeus, of holy Thetis and Peleus, and that Creteus' delicate daughter Hippolyta wanted to shackle him by a trick, by persuading the lord who watched over the Magnesians, her husband, with crafty plans to be her accomplice. She rigged a lying, made-up tale, that that man had had a go at their nuptual marriage in Acastus' (own) bed.

---

[98] Thus A. Köhnken, *CQ* 24, 1974, 204; Gerber *ad loc.* (contra Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 234).

25. αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μέν

The chorus of Muses sing, accompanied by Apollo's *phorminx*. Having begun with an address to Zeus, they proceed with a song praising (ὕμνησαν) the newly wedded couple, Peleus and Thetis. This 'hymn' includes the episode that Pindar quotes (26-36), the story of Peleus and Hippolyta; this story does in fact imply praise for Peleus, for it demonstrates his adherence to the laws of Zeus Xeinios in reward for which Zeus gave him Thetis. Pindar does not signal the end of the Muses' song. This conveys the suggestion that the remainder of the ode, including the praise of Pytheas and his family, is part of the song of the Muses. πρώτιστον μέν characterizes the song about Peleus and Thetis, including the episode about Peleus and Hippolyta, as the first part of the Muses' performance. A corresponding ἔπειτα δέ (or something similar), will never follow.[99] By leading the audience to anticipate another part of the Muses' hymn, πρώτιστον μέν helps to convey the suggestion that the song of the Muses does not end at line 41 with the shift from the heroic past to the present occasion.[100] For the function of this strategy see interpretation, pp. 72/3, 79/80, 85/6.

Referring to a story participant with a pronoun in the marked position directly before δέ is a very common means of effecting *topic shift*. αἱ δέ introduces the Muses as the new *topic*. Cf. my notes on line 32 below (pp. 155/6), *P.*8.48 (pp. 535/6), *P.*8.8 (p. 479).

26. Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι

The Muses traditionally begin their songs with an address to Zeus. In their catalogue of gods at the beginning of Hesiod's *Theogony* (11-21) Zeus is mentioned first.[101] Many poets have followed their exam-

---

[99] The scholiast tries to get rid of this irregularity by taking πρώτιστον with Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι only (αἱ Μοῦσαι, φησί, πρῶτον μὲν ὕμνησαν τὸν Δία, μετὰ δὲ τὸν Δία ὕμνησαν δευτέραν τὴν Θέτιν, ἔπειτα τρίτον τὸν Πηλέα, καὶ διηγήσαντο ὅπως κτλ, Σ. 46a, III 94 Dr.; cf. also Σ 46b). The word order, however, pleads against this. The position of πρώτιστον μέν before the main verb suggests that the qualification applies to the sentence as a whole. Moreover, both the placement of Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι and the fact that the present participle is used makes clear that this phrase provides background information that is off the main story line, which makes it difficult to take this phrase as constituting an independent step in the narrative sequence on which πρώτιστον would exclusively throw its force.

[100] For a similar example of manipulating the audience's linear perception of the text by means of a non-corresponding anticipatory marker cf. τὰ μέν in *N.*3.43 with my note (pp. 336/7).

[101] Lines 47-9 (δεύτερον αὖτε Ζῆνα θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν, | ἀρχόμεναί θ' ὑμνεῦσι θεαὶ λήγουσαί τ' ἀοιδῆς, | ὅσσον φέρτατός ἐστι θεῶν κάρτει τε μέγιστος) have sometimes been taken to refer to the habit of beginning with Zeus, but unfortunately line 48 does not scan, —which, combined with the fact that "it is nonsense to say that the Muses sing of Zeus second, both first and last", is reason for West (*ad loc.*, pp. 172/3, following Guyet) to condemn this line.

ple: cf. the opening lines of *N.*2: ὅθεν περ καὶ Ὁμηρίδαι | ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ' ἀοιδοὶ | ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, καὶ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ | καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγώνων νικαφορίας δέδεκται πρῶτον Νεμεαίου | ἐν πολυϋμνήτωι Διὸς ἄλσει[102]; the προοίμιον ascribed to Terpander: Ζεῦ, πάντων ἀρχά, πάντων ἀγήτωρ, | Ζεῦ, σοὶ πέμπω ταύταν ὕμνων ἀρχάν, *fr.*3 Gostoli (*PMG* 698 Page); ἐγὼν δ' ἀείσομαι ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχομένα, Alcm.*fr.*89 Calame (*PMG* 29 Page); ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε Μοῖσαι, Theoc.17.1; Arat.*Phaen.*1, etc.

A προοίμιον often is an invocation of a god. Twenty-three of the fourty-five Pindaric and nine of the surviving thirteen Bacchylideic epinicia open with addresses to deities (see my note on the proem of *N.*3, pp. 241/2). According to tradition the so-called Homeric hymns were performed as preludes to epic rhapsody. Thucydides uses the noun προοίμιον to refer to the Homeric hymn to Apollo (3.104).[103] Almost all the shorter Homeric hymns are formally characterized as proems in that they end with a formula announcing another hymn (e.g. σεῦ δ' ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον, *h.Hom.*5.11, cf. the closures of 9 and 13 and also those of 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 33).[104] In the closure of *h.Hom.*31 (ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρξάμενος κλήισω μερόπων γένος ἀνδρῶν | ἡμιθέων ὧν ἔργα θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ἔδειξαν), the hymn to the god is said to be followed by a story about heroes. In *Od.*8.499 it is said of Demodocus, when he is invited to sing about the Trojan war, that ὁ δ' ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἤρχετο, φαῖνε δ' ἀοιδήν.

The Muses' traditional choice for Zeus as the starting point of their hymns is especially felicitous on this occasion, as the bridegroom who is to be celebrated by their hymn is Zeus' grandson. Pindar's motifs for explicitly mentioning the theme of the Muses' proem in an ode for Pytheas are comparable: as a member of the Aeginetan elite he traced his lineage back to Zeus. Moreover, the Nemean Games where Pytheas had won were Zeus' games. Cf. Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἷμα, σέο δ' ἀγών, *N.*3.65 (with my note, pp. 372/3), also for an Aeginetan victor.

25-26. σεμνὰν Θέτιν | Πηλέα θ', ὥς τε

σεμνάν emphasizes Thetis' divinity and thus Peleus' exceptional privilege.

The adjective does not occur in Homer. For σεμνός as an epithet for gods and goddesses of lower rank (i.e., who are not Olympic), cf. Ἡρακλέης

[102] See T. Kirscher, 'Pindars Rhapsodengedicht (Zu Nem.2)', *WS* 78, 1965, 32-9.

[103] Cf. Σ.*ad loc.*: ἐκ προοιμίου· ἐξ ὕμνου· ὕμνους γὰρ τὰ προοίμια ἐκάλουν. Cf. also Plut.*Mus.*1132 (§ 4), 1133 (§ 6), Proclus *Chrest. ap.* Phot.320a; on these passages: H. Koller, *Philologus* 100, 156, 183/4.

[104] On the preludic character and the *topica* of the Homeric hymns in general, see H. Koller, *Philologus* 100, 1956, 174-82.

cεμνὸν θάλος Αἰακιδᾶν, *O*.6.68; cεμνᾶν Χαρίτων, *O*.14.8, cf. *Pae*.3.2, *fr*.95.4; cεμνᾶι...| Ματέρι παρ μεγάλαι, *fr*.70b.8/9, cf. *P*.3.79; ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ cεμνῶν γονάτων...| ἅπτομαι, *N*.8.13/4. The epithet may also be used of 'sacred' places (e.g. *O*.9.6, *P*.9.30, *N*.1.1-3, *N*.10.28, *fr*.95.2) and of other 'sacred' things (*O*.7.42, *N*.7.22/3, *N*.3.69/70). See also Poltera, *Langage de Simonide*, p. 186 (§ 184).

The particles **θ'...τε** coordinate cεμνὰν Θέτιν, Πηλέα, and the subordinate clause introduced by ὡc syntactically on the same level. But, logically, the second τε will turn out to be inclusive rather than connective. The Muses' song of praise (ὕμνηcαν, 25) about Peleus and Thetis includes the episode that Pindar quotes (26-36) about Peleus and Hippolyta, for this episode does in fact praise Peleus, as it illustrates Peleus' obedience to the laws of Zeus Xeinios in reward for which Zeus gave him Thetis.

For 'inclusive' τε cf. τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰcθμῶι διπλόα θάλλοιc' ἀρετά, | Φυλακίδ', ἄγκειται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν | Πυθέαι τε, παγκρατίου, *I*.5.17-9, 'at the Isthmus a double victory is planted for you and thrives; this is also the case at Nemea for both of you, [one for you] and [one] for your brother'; Ἐμμενίδαιc Θήρωνί τ', *O*.3.39.

26-37 The Story of Peleus and Hippolyta

After having killed his half-brother Phocus, Peleus fled to the court of Actor, king of Phthia, by whose adopted son Eurytion he was purified. Actor gave him his daughter in marriage, and a third part of the kingdom (Apollod.3.13.1; or his whole land, D.S.4.72.5). One day Eurytion took Peleus to hunt the Calydonean boar. Peleus speared him by accident (Apollod.3.13.2). He ran off to Iolcus. Here he was once more purified, this time by Acastus, son of Pelias. Acastus' wife, Cretheus' daughter Hippolyta,[105] tried to seduce Peleus. But he repulsed her advances, in spite of her beauty (cf. ἁβρά, line 26). Hippolyta went to Acastus and accused Peleus of having tried to seduce her (Apollod.3.13.3, Hor.*C*.3.7.17-22). Cf. also Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολκὸν | πολεμίαι χερὶ προcτραπὼν | Πηλεὺc παρέδωκεν Αἱμόνεccιν | δάμαρτοc Ἱππολύταc Ἀκάcτου δολίαιc | τέχναιcι χρηcαμένου, *N*.4.54-8. Acastus believed the story, but he did not dare to kill the man whom he had purified (Apollod.3.13.3; Σ.*ad* *N*.4.54, 59; Zenobius, *Prov*.5.20). His attempts to have Peleus killed by a gang of wild Centaurs were frustrated by the intervention of Chiron (*N*.4.59/60; Hes. quoted by Σ.*ad* *N*.4.59).

---

[105] She is called Κρηθεὶc Ἱππολύτα *h.l.* and Ἱππολύτα in *N*.4.57. In Σ.*ad* line 25 (46a III 94 Dr.) she is called Κρηθηὶc ἡ τοῦ Ἱππολύτου θυγάτηρ. Σ.*ad* A.R.1.224: Κρηθηὶc ἡ Ἱππολύτη. Apollodorus calls her Astydameia (3.13.3, 7).

The story of Peleus and Hippolyta is not told chronologically. First it is told that Hippolyta tried to convince her husband with the mischievous tale that Peleus had tried to seduce her (26-31). Then the true state of affairs is told: the contrary was the case, Hippolyta had tried to seduce Peleus, but he rebuffed her advances (31-33). Chronologically this precedes the story of Hippolyta lying to her husband. Then it is told that Peleus fears the anger of his grandfather Zeus and that he promised him Thetis as a bride (33-6). The reference to Zeus' persuation of his rival Poseidon (37), which immediately precedes his promise, serves as a transition to the story of Poseidon's attending the Isthmian Games (37-41), which serves as a transition to the person of the victor (41). In sum, the chronological order of the narrated events is: 1. Hippolyta tries to seduce Peleus, but he refuses, because he fears the anger of Zeus; 2. Hippolyta tells her husband that Peleus tried to seduce her; 3. Zeus persuades Poseidon to allow him to give away Thetis to Peleus; 4. Zeus promises Thetis to Peleus; 5. the wedding is celebrated. The narrated order is: 5 – 2 – 1 – 4 – 3. For Pindar's concern for suspense see interpretation, pp. 70, 73, and cf. my note on *P.*8.39/40 (p. 527).

26-27. νιν ἁβρὰ Κρηθεῒϲ Ἱππολύτα δόλωι πεδᾶϲαι | ἤθελε 'Creteus' delicate daughter Hippolyta wanted to shackle him (i.e., Peleus) by a trick.' The phrase δόλωι πεδᾶϲαι is euphemistically vague. The following lines will make clear that Hippolyta wanted revenge because Peleus had rebuffed her advances, and that she tried to accomplish this by telling her husband that Peleus had attempted to seduce her: this is her δόλοϲ (cf. *N.*4.57). Exactly what she wanted to achieve with her mischievous tale (i.e., the specific reference of πεδᾶϲαι) is left to the imagination of the audience, but her only possible objective is that her husband would kill Peleus. The audience who were familiar with the story knew that Acastus did indeed attempt to kill Peleus (see preceding note).

The verb **πεδάω**, 'binding, fastening' (cf. *Od.*21.391, A.*Eu.*635, Hdt.6.23, etc.), is often used metaphorically, in the sense of 'hindering, hampering' (cf. the usage of the English verb 'to shackle'): ἀλλὰ ϲύ πέρ μοι εἰπέ...| ὅϲ τίϲ μ' ἀθανάτων πεδάαι καὶ ἔδηϲε κελεύθου, | νόϲτον θ', ὡϲ ἐπὶ πόντον ἐλεύϲομαι ἰχθυόεντα, *Od.*4.379-81; ἵππων ἁψάμενοϲ γαιήοχον Ἐννοϲίγαιον | ὄμνυθι μὴ μὲν ἑκὼν τὸ ἐμὸν δόλωι ἅρμα πεδῆϲαι, *Il.*23.584/5; ἐξ ὕπνου μ' ἀνεγείρειϲ | ἡδέοϲ, ὅϲ μ' ἐπέδηϲε φίλα βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψαϲ, *Od.*23.16/7; Νεϲτόρειον γὰρ ἵπποϲ ἅρμ' ἐπέδα | Πάριοϲ ἐκ βελέων δαϊχθείϲ, *P.*6.32/3; Ποϲείδαον...| πέδαϲον[106] ἔγχοϲ Οἰνομάου χάλκεον, | ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ

[106] J.T. Kakridis, 'Das Pelops und Iamos Gebet bei Pindar', *Hermes* 63, 1928, 24/5 (= *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [edd. W.M. Calder III & J. Stern], Darmstadt 1970,

ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἁρμάτων | ἐς ᾿Αλιν, κρατεῖ δὲ πέλασον, *O*.1.75-8. It can be used as an euphemism for 'killing': πέφνε δὲ τρεῖς καὶ δέκ' ἄνδρας· | τετράτωι δ' αὐτὸς πεδάθη, *fr*.135; and probably in Ἰάλεμον ὠμοβόλωι[107] | νούσωι {ὅτι}[108] πεδαθέντα σθένος, *fr*.128c.9/10 (139), for the presence of Ialemos, the personified Dirge, is best accounted for in case of death. In Πάρ[ι]ος ἑ[καβόλος βροτη]σίωι δέμαϊ θεός, | Ἰλίωι δὲ θῆκεν ἄφαρ ὀψιτέραν ἅλωσιν | κυανοπλόκοιο παῖδα ποντίας Θέτιος βιατάν, | πιστὸν ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν θρασεῖ φόνωι πεδάσαις, *Pae*.6.79-86[109], the usage of πεδάω cannot be called euphemistic, for the bad word (φόνος) is pronounced.[110] Cf. also: τὸν τόθ' ὑπ' Ἰδομενῆι Ποσειδάων ἐδάμασσε, | θέλξας ὄσσε φαεινά, πέδησε δὲ φαίδιμα γυῖα, *Il*.13.434/5.

ἁβρά emphasizes Hippolyta's physical attractiveness: Peleus deserves all the more admiration for his not falling for her advances.

ἁβρά means 'soft, nice to touch'. It is often used as a positive qualification of women, cf. ἁβρὴ παρθένος, Hes.*fr*.218 Rz.; A.*fr*.313, S.*Tr*.523; ἅβραι Χάριτες, Sapph.*fr*.60. Also of children: ἴων ξανθαῖσι καὶ παμπορφύροις ἀκτῖσι βεβρεγμένος ἁβριὸν | σῶμα, *O*.6.55/6; Anacr.17, 65. It can be used metaphorically as a qualification of inanimate or abstract notions, the haptic denotation losing its relevance, as e.g. of a στέφανος, won at the Isthmian Games (*I*.8.72-4), of κῦδος (*O*.5.7; *I*.1.50 with Privitera *ad loc.*, pp. 151/2), πλοῦτος (*P*.3.110) and of fame after death resulting in τιμά (τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται | ὧν θεὸς ἁβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων, *N*.7.31/2). ἁβρὰ πάσχειν is used as equivalent to εὖ πάσχειν (*fr*.2.1, Thgn.722). Any negative connotations of 'excessive luxury' which are not uncommon in later Greek (E.*Ba*.968, *IA* 1343, Pl.*Alc*.1.122c, X.*Cyr*.8.8.15, etc.) are absent in Pindar. For the noun ἁβρότας see my note on *P*.8.89 (p. 590).

27-28. ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπὸν | πείσαις' ἀκοίταν

Hippolyta wanted to trick Peleus 'by persuading the lord who watched over the Magnesians, her husband, to be her accomplice.' Hippolyta's husband is Acastus. He is referred to by name in line 30. He was King of Iolcus, a city in Magnesia, the eastern part of Thessaly. ξυνᾶνα is proleptic.[111] The intended and achieved goal of

---

169/70) suggested that Pindar's choice of πεδάω can be explained by the fact that this verb often occurs in magical texts, not seldom pertaining to chariot-races. This may be true for *O*.1.76. For a more extensive discussion, see Gerber *ad loc.* I see no reason to suppose that Hippolyta made use of magic in order to harm Peleus.

[107] Hermann: ὁμοβόλωι codd.: ὠμοβόρωι Schneidewin.

[108] del. Hermann.

[109] "Πεδάω 'hemmen' bezeichnet hier treffend das plötzliche Ende, das Apollo dem sieghaften Vorwärtsstürmen des Achilles bereitet", Radt *ad loc.*

[110] Thus Radt *ad loc.* contra Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, p. 80.

[111] Thus Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 53), Bury *ad loc.* (p. 92). The interpretation ξυνᾶνα, *sc.* βίου (Eustathius) entails that ἀκοίταν is a redundant paraphrase of ξυνᾶνα. Bergk adopted this interpretation and altered ἀκοίταν to Ἄκαστον in order to avoid the redundancy.

Hippolyta's persuasion was to make Acastus her accomplice, i.e., the executer of her revenge. There is also a touch of irony in the choice of this noun, since Acastus did not himself realize that he was being used as a tool in Hippolyta's hands.

For the 'proleptic' double accusative construction with πείθω, cf. ὅτε τὰν ὁμοπάτριον | ἄγαγες Ἡσιόναν πιθὼν δάμαρτα κοινόλεκτρον, A.*Pr.*559/60. Cf. also: οὔτοι με ξένον | οὐδ' ἀδαήμονα Μοισᾶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταὶ | Θῆβαι, *fr.*198a; S.*OC* 919, E.*Med.*294/5, E.*El.*919, etc. For πείθω referring to persuasion by unfair means, 'mislead,' cf. e.g. *Il.*1.132 (cf. 6.360), *Od.*2.106 (cf. 14.123), etc.

For ξυνάων/**ξυνάν** cf. κακῶν ξυνήονας ἔργων, Hes.*Th.*595; ξυνήονας ἔργων | ἀργαλέων, 601/2; τοὺς μὲν ὦν, ὅσσοι μόλον αὐτοφύτων | ἑλκέων ξυνάονες, ἢ πολιῶι χαλκῶι μέλη τετρωμένοι |...λύσαις ἄλλον ἀλλοίων ἀχέων | ἔξαγεν, *P.*3.47-51, 'partners of sores,' i.e. afflicted by them. Cf. also ξυνήια, *Il.*1.124, 23.809. For **ἀκοίτας** cf. Ναΐδος ἀκοίτας Σιληνός, *fr.*156. Cf. also ἄκοιτιν in 36 below. The more common word is πόσις (used 7x by Pindar). For **σκοπός** in the sense of 'supervisor' cf. *O.*1.54, *O.*6.59, *Pae.*6.94; cf. also *P.*3.27.

28. ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν

ποικίλος denotes 'variegated,' having many colours (cf. *P.*8.46, *I.*4.18, *N.*10.35/6, etc.). The adjective can be used metaphorically to refer to a different adornment than a variety of colours (e.g. ποικίλον ὕμνον, *O.*6.87; cf. line 42 below, *fr.*179, *fr.*194.1-3, etc.). When qualifying a person, ποικίλος refers to this person's ability to manoeuvre cleverly in every situation. Such a person is 'varied,' as he or she cunningly adapts to every situation.

Cf. ποικίλος γὰρ ἀνὴρ | κἀκ τῶν ἀμηχάνων πόρους εὐμηχάνους πορίζειν, Ar.*Eq.*758/9; ὁρῶ, Προμηθεῦ, καὶ παραινέσαι γέ σοι | θέλω τὰ λῷστα, καίπερ ὄντι ποικίλωι, A.*Pr.*307/8 (Prometheus is not the kind of man who needs advice); ποικίλος ἀεὶ πέφυκε τοῦ τ' ὄχλου μέτα, E.*IA* 526 (of Odysseus, cf. the Homeric ποικιλομήτης); θυμέ, φίλους κατὰ πάντας ἐπίστρεφε ποικίλον ἦθος, | ὀργὴν συμμίσγων ἥντιν' ἕκαστος ἔχει, Thgn.213/4;

This derogatory metaphorical sense applies to ποικίλος here: Hippolyta's plans are 'embroidered' and 'varied' in that they are cunning and complex, cleverly anticipating adaptation to various situations that may arise. Cf. ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον | δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι, *O.*1.28/9; ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ, | κοὐ ποικίλων δεῖ τἄνδιχ' ἑρμηνευμάτων, E.*Ph.*469/70; ὅστίς τοι δοκέει τὸν πλησίον ἴδμεναι οὐδέν, | ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μοῦνος ποικίλα δήνε' ἔχειν, | κεῖνός γ' ἄφρων ἐστί, νόου βεβλαμμένος ἐσλοῦ· | ἴσως γὰρ πάντες ποικίλ' ἐπιστάμεθα· | ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὐκ ἐθέλει κακοκερδείῃσιν ἕπεσθαι, | τῶι δὲ δολοπλοκίαι μᾶλλον ἄπιστοι ἅδον, Thgn.222-6; cf. also the use of αἰόλος in μέγιστον δ' αἰόλωι ψεύδεσι γέρας ἀντέταται, *N.*8.25.

On ποικίλος see further: Gerber on *O.*1.29 (pp. 63/4); L.F. Guillen, *Pindaro: Estructura y resortes del quehacer poetico,* Madrid 1975, 161-5; H. Kriegler, *Untersuchung zu den optischen und akustischen Daten der bakchylideischen Dichtung,* Diss. Vienna 1969, 35/6; D. Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache,* Meisenheim am Glan 1974, 14-6.

For βούλευμα cf. *fr.*61.4, A.*Pr.*171, 619, *Th.*594, S.*OT* 45, etc.

29. ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον
'She rigged a lying, made-up tale.' The following ὡς clause gives its content; lines 31/2 explain why it was false. **ψεύστας** is the adjective[112] for the lier rather than for lies. Cf. ἀνὴρ ψεύστης, Hdt.7.209; Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, Epimenid.1 (cit. Call.*Jov.*8, *Ep.Tit.*1.12), cf. *AP* 7.273 (Leon.), 275 (Gaet.). So 'lying' rather than 'false.' Thus it effects a semi-personfication of the λόγος, investing it with independence and conjuring up the idea that "the λόγος, when constructed, lies on its own account" (Bury *ad loc.*, p. 92). **ποιητός** is frequent in Homer, where it is always used as a qualification of concrete objects in the sense of 'well-made.'[113] Here it is used with negative connotations, in the sense of 'made-up, invented, feigned,' because a λόγος ought to be a true report of what happened: it is wrong for a λόγος to be 'made.' The same negative connotations are activated in οἱ δ' ἐκβαλόντες δάκρυα ποιητῶι τρόπωι, E.*Hel.*1547, because tears ought to be sincere instead of 'made.' **συμπάγνυμι**[114] means 'constructing solidly.' Cf. οἰκήματα δὲ σύμπηκτα ἐξ ἀνθερικῶν, Hdt.4.190; *Il.*5.902, E.*Supp.*938, Pl.*Ti.*46b, 59e, 73d, 81b, 85d, 91b, Theoc.8.23, Critias 2.11, etc. The force of the prefix is to construct 'sturdily, without cracks'. Hippolyta 'constucted' her story 'carefully, the reasonong being watertight.' For the metaphor cf. κακῶς παγέντας ὅρκους, E.*IA* 395; τὸ τῆς ὅλης πῆγμα σοφίας, Ph.1.536.

For the simplex cf. νῆας ἔπηξε, *Il.*2.664 (cf. Hdt.5.83), *Od.*5.163, Hes.*Op.*455, *O.*6.3, *O.*10.45, Hdt.6.12 (cf. 7.119), A.*Pers.*496, etc. See also my note on *N.*3.62 (pp. 363/4). For **λόγος** referring to a 'story', an 'account, report' of what happened, cf. ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον | δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι, *O.*1.28/9, *P.*4.132/3, *O.*7.20-2; οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος, Stes.*fr.*15.1, etc.

---

[112] The word is used as a noun in ψεῦσταί τ' ὀρχησταί τε, χοροιτυπίῃσιν ἄριστοι, *Il.*24.261.

[113] Cf. δόμοις ἔνι ποιητοῖσιν, *Il.*5.198, *Od.*13.306; ποιητὰς ... πύλας, *Il.*12.470; σάκεος πύκα ποιητοῖο, *Il.*18.608; τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο, *Od.*1.133; ᾦξεν δὲ θύρας θαλάμου πύκα ποιητοῖο, *Od.*1.436, etc.

[114] Ms. D has συνέπλεξε. This is the more common metaphor. Cf. πλέκων ποικίλον ὕμνον, *O.*6.86; ῥήματα πλέκων, *N.*4.94; and phrases like δολόπλοκος. The *lectio difficilior* generally accepted by the editors.

30. ὣϲ ἆρα

The mss. have ἄρα (ᾰ-), but the second syllable of this line must be long. The same error occurs in *O*.8.46 (where Moschopolus reads ἆρα), *P*.4.78, *I*.6.55, and *I*.8.65. Obviously APA has to interpreted as ἆρα in these cases—as it has been suggested by Boeckh—, which is attested as "a substitute for ἄρα, in various uses of that particle" (Denniston, p. 44).[115]

Schroeder reads ἦρα[116], meant to represent a *crasis* of ἦ and ἄρα. Schroeder believed that ἆρα is an Ionic and Attic form produced by *crasis* of ἦ ἄρα and that ἦρα is the correct form of it in Doric and Aeolic (see H.L. Ahrens, *Kleine Schriften*, Hannover 1891, I 60)[117]. However, as Braswell (on *P*.4.78) observed, long-term non-interrogative ἆρα is always postpositive, whereas ἦρα always stands in first position (exept at *P*.9.37, cf. Tycho Mommsen *ad loc.*), which supports the theory that only ἦρα is produced by a *crasis* of ἦ ἄρα (for ἦ always stands in first position), while ἆρα is a mere metrical variant[118] of ἄρα, which is always postpositive as well.

ἄρα signals that the speaker suggests "that he is not himself any more committed to his statement than the addressee can be supposed to be." In dialogues it pretends "that both partners have dismissed all personal considerations and are simply 'following the λόγοϲ where it leads'"[119]. In introducing direct or oblique speech the particle ἄρα may serve to announce an extraneous ingredient and to mark the demarkation between what the speaker/narrator is personally responsible for and what is he cites from an independent source.[120] By using ἆρα the poet indicates that he does not take the statement 'Peleus seduced Hippolyta' on his own account. ἆρα makes explicit that the

---

[115] Denniston (pp. 44-6) gives the following examples of non-interrogative ἆρα: Archil.*fr*.81.5, A.*Pers*.348, S.*Aj*.738, 980, 1238, 1368, *El*.1179, *OC* 408, 409, 858, 1400, *OT* 1395, *Ph*.106, 114, *fr*.845 E.*Hipp*.1012, 1086, *El*.374, 1229, *Ph*.566, 1675, *Or*.190, 1207, *IA* 311 *Andr*.1114, *Cyc*.638, *Heracl*.116, 268, 895, *fr*.36, Ar.*Nu*.1301, *Av*.91, 161, 1530, 1688, *Vesp*.3, 839, *Lys*.933, *Pl*.579, 920; εἰ ἆρα: E.*Rh*.118; ὣϲ ἆρα: Archil.*fr*.174.2 W.

[116] Ἦρα is attested in the codd. of *P*.9.37, *I*.7.3, and *P*.11.38 (ἦρ'). In ἦ ῥα (codd.: ἦρα Schroeder) Μηδείαϲ ἐπέων ϲτίχεϲ, *P*.4.57, the reading of the codd. must be preserved (ἔφη Σ.).

[117] Wackernagel wants to read δὴ ἄρα (synizesis) here; this combination is, however, not found in Pindar (Denniston [p. 43] lists the following instances where this combination occurs: *Od*.7.18, Demod.*fr*.5.4, Hes.*Th*.58, 883, 888, Pl.*R*.369c, 423a, *Phdr*.273e). Moreover δή does not fit in the context (resulting in a paraphrase like: 'that is what she said as it is plain to see', or something of the kind).

[118] "α prius producitur propter liquidam", Erasmus Schmid *ad O*.8.46; cf. my note on line 13 above, p. 116.

[119] Van Ophuijsen, 'OYN, ΑΠΑ, ΔΗ, TOINYN: The Linguistic Articulation of Arguments in Plato's *Phaedo*', *Particle Usage in the Usage of Particles* (Sicking & Van Ophuijsen), p. 82.

[120] See Van Ophuijsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-7.

subordinate clause introduced by ὡς (30/1) contains the purport of the ψεύσταν ποιητὸν λόγον (29) and it excludes both the possibility that ὡς in line 30 operates at the same level as ὡς in 26 and the possibility that ὡς in line 30 introduces a clause containing a motivation or explanation for ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον.

Cf. αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων ὅδε, | ὡς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην | ἔμειξαν, Archil.*fr.*174 W., where ἄρ' indicates that ἀλώπηξ καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην | ἔμειξαν has to be put on the account of the αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων and that this does not give voice to the views of the poet. Cf. also πυνθάνομαι τὸν πάντα λόγον θεράποντος ὃς ἐμὲ προπέμπων ἔξω πόλιος ἐνεχείρισε τὸ βρέφος, ὡς ἄρα Μανδάνης τε εἴη παῖς κτλ., Hdt.1.111.5, where ἄρα is "signifying that the following clause belongs to the λόγος...It is all the more appropriate as the adjunct clause ὅς...τὸ βρέφος has intervened, which might be followed by a clause introduced by ὡς calling for a different, e,g, a causal or temporal interpretation; without the particle the status of the clause would not have become unambiguous before the oblique optative εἴη" (Van Ophuijsen, *Particle Usage*, p. 126).

30-31. νυμφείας ἐπείρα κεῖνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου | εὐνᾶς

Hippolyta told her husband Acastus the untrue story that 'he (Peleus)[121] had had a go at their nuptual marriage in Acastus' (own) bed,' which is a poetic but unequivocal way of saying that Hippolyta accused Peleus of having seduced her. ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου adds saliency to the accusation and is illustrative of the clever rhetoric with which Hippolyta turned her husband against Peleus.

εὐνά denotes 'bed.'[122] Pindar uses εὐνά only metaphorically, of 'marriage,' which is the sense here (as νυμφείας emphasizes), or 'sexual intercourse.' ἐν λέκτροις excludes the possibility of this being the sole example of the literal usage of the noun in Pindar.

For the noun in the sense of 'marriage' cf. *O.*7.6, *I.*8.30, *P.*2.27, etc. For the noun in the sense of 'sex' cf. *O.*9.43-5, *P.*9.40/1, *P.*2.35, *P.*9.12/3, *fr.*122.7/8, etc. **νυμφείας**, 'bridal,' may seem redundant with εὐνᾶς, 'marriage.' It emphasizes, however, that Hippolyta was an officially married woman, and thus it underscores the seriousness of Peleus' alleged crime.

πειράω denotes 'trying, testing.'[123] Cf. e.g. πειρῶντι δὲ καὶ χρυσὸς ἐν βασάνωι πρέπει | καὶ νόος ὀρθός, *P.*10.67/8. When the verb goes with

---

[121] κεῖνος refers to Peleus. Two men play a role in this passage, Peleus and Acastus; κεῖνος is used to refer to the former, because the latter is last mentioned.

[122] Cf. εὐνῆι' ἔνι μαλακῆι, *Il.*9.618; ἔβη εἰς εὐνήν, *Od.*1.427, etc.; also of soldiers in the field: Th.3.112, A.*Ag.*559, etc.

[123] It can be used both in the active and in the middle and absolutely (act.: Th.4.25, middle: *Il.*5.129) or with an infinitive (act.: *Il.*8.8, middle: *Il.*4.5), a subordinate clause (act.: *Il.*4.66, middle: *Il.*13.806), a participle (only in the middle: Hdt.1.77), or a genitive-object (*v.i.*).

an accusative-object, the object nearly always (the few exceptions include Luc.*Am*.46) refers to a woman and the verb to 'making an attempt on her honour, having a go at her, raping her.'

Cf. καὶ τάς γ' ἑταίρας φαςὶ τὰς Κορινθίας, | ὅταν μὲν αὐτάς τις πένης πειρῶν τύχηι, κτλ, Ar.*Pl*.149/50; πειρᾶι μὲν οὖν ἴςως cε καὶ τῶν τιτθίων | ἐφάπτεταί cου λανθάνειν δοκῶν ἐμέ, *ibid*.1067/8; cf. *Eq*.517; ἵνα cύ γε...πειρᾶις ἐνθαῦτα τὴν παιδίςκην· καὶ πρότερον δὲ μεθύων εἷλκες αὐτήν, Lys.1.12; Ar.*Pax* 763, Th.6.54.3, etc. In Pindar we have one example of this usage, but in the middle: μεγαλοκευθέεςςι ἔν ποτε θαλάμοις | Διὸς ἄκοιτιν ἐπειρᾶτο (*sc*. Ixion), *P*.2.33/4.

When construed with a genitive-object, the verb can be used in a neutral way, in the sense of 'trying out, testing the quality,' or with connotations of hostility and violence.

In a neutral sense: ἀμφὶ δ' ἑταῖροι | πείρηςαν τευχέων βεβιημένοι, οὐδ' ἐδύναντο | κεῖνο δόρυ γνάμψαι τυτθόν γέ περ, A.R.3.1248-50; middle: τόξου πειρήςεται, *Od*.21.159, 113, 135, cf. also 410; Thgn.126, etc. With connotations of hostility and violence: πρὸς ὧν ταῦτα οὐ δικαιοῦν πειρᾶν τῆς πόλιος πρίν γε δὴ ἱροῖςι χρήςηται, Hdt.6.82, 'test the strength of the city, i.e., attack it'; πειράςαντες πρῶτον τοῦ χωρίου, Th.1.61; τῆς Νιςαίας πειρᾶςαι, 4.70. In the middle: οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν πρὶν πειρήςαιτ' Ἀχιλῆος, *Il*.21.580; πειρῷντο τοῦ τείχους, Th.2.81; πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας, *N*.1.43, 'for the first time he tested his strength in a fight.' Also of athletics: Cf. οἱ δὲ παλαιμοςύνης ἀλγεινῆς πειρήςαντο, *Od*.8.126; πείρηςαι ἀέθλων, *Od*.8.145; and also ἀέθλους | πολλούς, τοὺς Φαίηκες ἐπειρήςαντ' Ὀδυςῆος, *Od*.8.23; οἱ δ' ἦ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐπειρήςαντο πόδεςςι, *Od*.8.120; τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν πειρώμενον ἀγωνίας ἀφροςύνας παραλύει, *O*.2.52; ἐλπίδες δ' ὀκνηρότεραι γονέων παιδὸς βίαν | ἔςχον ἐν Πυθῶνι πειρᾶςθαι καὶ Ὀλυμπίαι ἀέθλων, *N*.11.22/3; thus metaphorically in: ἔπειτα πλούτου πειρῶν...μέγαν ἄλλοθι κλᾶρον ἔχω, *Pae*.4.46-8, 'have a go at wealth,' i.e., try to win it.

Here the verb with the genitive object has connotations of hostility and violence: Peleus is accused of having 'attacked, violated' the marriage. The associations with raping are strengthened by the fact that the verb may have exactly this meaning, though with a different construction.[124]

•*Aspect:* The *actio* of πειράω is durative. That it is not terminative appears from τὸ δὲ χωρίον τοῦτο...ἐπείραςε...Ἀριςταγόρας...κατοικίςαι, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ Ἠδώνων ἐξεκρούςθη, Th.4.102, where an aorist is used to refer to an attempt which failed, and from λαὸν δὲ ςτῆςον παρ' ἐρινεόν, ἔνθα μάλιςτα | ἀμβατός ἐςτι πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τεῖχος· | τρὶς γὰρ τῆι γ' ἐθόντες ἐπειρήςανθ' οἱ ἄριςτοι, *Il*.6.433-5, where in is clear from the fact that

[124] This is a case of relevance of the 'reflected meaning', in Leech's terminology (*Semantics*, pp. 16/7, 23).

Troy has not been sacked then that the attacks have failed.[125] Thus, since the verb is not terminative, the choice of the imperfect ἐπεῖρα here does *not* convey that in Hippolyta's tale Peleus had been unsuccessful in his attempt to rape her: Pindar leaves implicit whether or not Peleus is accused of rape or of attempted rape. The choice of the imperfect reflects the information status of the verb. Apparently the verb lacks *focus-function*: in Hippolyta's story the issue is not so much that Peleus raped her (or tried to rape her), but that he did so while she was married in the very bed of her husband: νυμφείας...εὐνᾶς and ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου have *focus-function* in a higher degree than ἐπεῖρα. In other words, Pindar's account of Hippolyta's untrue story bears witness to her rhetorical dexterity aiming at maximalizing the chance that Acastus turned against Peleus.

For the splitting of the adjective (νυμφείας) and substantive (εὐνᾶς) by stanza end, see S.R. Slings, 'Information Unit and Metrical Unit', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), ex. 11.

Epode B

31-34

This was the other way around. For she tried hard to persuade him and begged him with all her heart. Her steep words stimulated his feelings. Immediately he repulsed the bride, out of fear of the anger of the Father, the god of Guests.

31. τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν

Not only was Hippolyta's story untrue, it was the exact opposite of what really happened. τό is subject, ἐναντίον predicate.[126] Although the iterative infix -σκ- does denote iterativity in the other three examples in Pindar (see my note on *N.*3.52, pp. 348/9), an iterative interpretation is implausible here[127]; εὐθύς (33) above all gives the impression that Pindar is talking about one occasion. πολλά in the next sentence refers to the intensity of Hippolyta's attempt, not to repeated attempts (see next note). The usage of ἔσκεν here is in keeping with the practice of Homer, who uses these iteratives as a metrical variation of an ordinary imperfect. Cf. *Il.*3.180, 6.153, *Od.*2.59, 4.270, and ἔσκον, *Il.*7.153.

---

[125] "With terminative actions the indicative of AS implies that the action has reached its goal, and the choice of PS may, but does not have to, point the way to an interpretation in which this is not so", Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 21; see also *ibid.* p. 38.

[126] Thus Slater, p. 153 (*s.v.* εἰμί). Independent εἰμί in the sense of 'being the case' is rare outside philisophic texts.

[127] For a different opinion see Bury *ad loc.* (p. 93).

31-32. πολλὰ γάρ μιν παντὶ θυμῶι | παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν
'For she came on to him with all her heart, very hard trying to seduce him.' Both πολλά and παντὶ θυμῶι emphasize the intensity and wholeheartedness of Hippolyta's attempts to seduce Peleus. She did everything she could: Peleus is all the more to be admired for not giving in to her advances. For μιν see next note.

παράφημι means 'speak at one's side, advise' (cf., e.g., μητρὶ δ' ἐγὼ παράφημι...| πατρὶ φίλωι ἐπίηρα φέρειν Διί, *Il.*1.577/8). The middle has the sense of 'advising to one's own advantage, persuading,' sometimes with the connotation of 'beguiling.'

μνηςτῆρας μαλακοῖς ἐπέεςςι | παρφάςθαι, *Od.*16.286/7 (= 19.5/6); εἰ δὲ cὺ δηιοτῆτος ἀφέξεαι ἠέ τιν' ἄλλον | παρφάμενος ἐπέεςςιν ἀποςτρέψεις πολέμοιο, κτλ, *Il.*12.248/9; αἴ κε νεώτερον ἄνδρα παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδὼς | παρφάμενος ἐπέεςςιν ἐποτρύνῃς χαλεπαίνειν, κτλ, *Od.*2.188/9; μαλακοῖςι παραιφάμενοι ἐπέεςςιν, Hes.*Th.*90; τὴν δὴ παρφάμεναι κοῦραι μαλακοῖςι λόγοιςιν | πεῖςαν ἐπιφραδέως, Parm.1.15/6. For the noun παραίφαςις/πάρφαςις, 'address, advice, persuasion,' cf., e.g., ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραίφαςίς ἐςτιν ἑταίρου, *Il.*11.793; ἔνθ' ἔνι μὲν φιλότης, ἐν δ' ἵμερος, ἐν δ' ὀαριςτύς, | πάρφαςις[128], ἥ τ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονεόντων, *Il.*14.216/7, of Aphrodite's cestus; παραίφαςιν εὗρεν ἐρώτων, *Anth.Planud.*5.373.3.

Pindar uses the verb twice, in the active, with impersonal objects in the sense of 'speaking not totally in accordance with the truth, beyond the real state of affairs, telling fibs or white lies.'[129]

It is, however, not the same as lying: καὶ γὰρ cέ, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψευδεῖ θιγεῖν, | ἔτραπε μείλιχος ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον, *P.*9.42/3 (Apollo asked Cheiron after the identity of a girl he admires, although he is the god who knows everything [cf. 44-9]). In ἐκέλευςεν δ' αὐτίκα χρυςάμπυκα μὲν Λάχεςιν | χεῖρας ἀντεῖναι, θεῶν δ' ὅρκον μέγαν | μὴ παρφάμεν, *O.*7.64-6, the phrase μὴ παρφάμεν refers to 'speaking out correctly and sincerely'. The only Pindaric occurrance of the noun πάρφαςις is in keeping with this sense: ἐχθρὰ δ' ἄρα πάρφαςις ἦν καὶ πάλαι, | αἱμύλων μύθων ὁμόφοιτος, δολοφραδής, κακοποιὸν ὄνειδος, *N.*8.32/3, a 'misrepresentation.'

Here the verb is in the middle, with a personal object, in the sense of 'trying to persuade.'[130] There is a certain degree of tautology in the phrase παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν to the extent that both verbs denote at-

---

[128] Cf. the common association between love and Πειθώ, e.g. *P.*9.39, perhaps Sapph.1.18, etc.

[129] For παρά in this sense cf. e.g. ἐν δίκαι τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν, *O.*2.16 (cf. *I.*7.47); παρὰ καιρόν, *O.*8.24, 9.38, *P.*10.4. Cf. also παράτροπος (*P.*2.35) and compounds like παροράω, παρακούω, παράγω, παραγιγνώςκω, etc.

[130] Connotations of deceit are absent: whereas Hippolyta does use deceit to trick her husband into revenging her on Peleus after his rejection of her, we have no reason to assume that she used deceit to seduce Peleus.

tempts to persuade. However, while λιτάνευεν, 'begged,' underscores Hippolyta's desire for Peleus, παρφαμένα alludes to the means she used and colours the phrase with connotations of 'trying to beguile, vamping.' On the verb see further Miller, *GRBS* 23, 1982, 111-20.

For **λιτανεύω**, entreat,' cf. πολλά νιν (*sc.* Aeacus) πολλοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν· | ἀβοατὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἄωτοι περιναιεταόντων | ἤθελον κείνου γε πείθεcθ' ἀναξίαις ἑκόντες, *N.*8.8-10; λιτανεύω, ἑκαβόλε, | Μοιcαίαιc ἀν[α]τιθεὶc τέχνα[ι]cι | χρηcτήριον [, *Pae.*9.38-40; for the construction here cf. πολλὰ δέ μιν λιτάνευε γέρων, ἱππηλάτα Οἰνεύc, *Il.*9.581. **πολλά** in these passages refers to the intensity (or length) of the entreaty. Cf. also πολλὰ μάλ' εὐχομένω γαιηόχωι ἐννοcιγαίωι, *Il.*9.183; αὐτίκα δ' εὔχετο πολλὰ Ποcειδάωνι ἄνακτι, *Od.*3.54, 393/4, 445/6; πολλὰ δ' εὐπλοκάμου πολιῆc ἁλὸc ἐν πελάγεccι | θεccάμενοι γλυκερὸν νόcτον, Archil.*fr.*8 W. For **παντὶ θυμῶι** cf. κεῖνοc αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν | παντὶ θυμῶι cύν τε δίκαι καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν, *P.*9.95/6; A.*Ag.*233, D.19.227; θυμῶι παντί, Paus.4.29.4; παντὶ τῶι θυμῶι, Plu.*Fab.*25.1, *De recta ratione audendi* 47f.

•*Aspect:* The imperfect λιτάνευεν does not convey iterativity ("the imperfect of repeated attempts," Bury *ad loc.*, p. 93). εὐθύc (33) makes clear that Pindar is talking about one occasion. Moreover, "iterativity *as such* does not decide the choice of the aspect form: that actions are to be understood as iterative actions is made clear by grammatical means (the iterative suffix[131] with the indicative, an optative) and/or by contextual indications," Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 34/5. The imperfect conveys that the communication contained in the verb is not complete in itself, in the sense that it gives rise to the question 'what happened next?[132] What was the consequence of Hippotyla's entreaty?' The tension is hightened by the imperfect κνίζον (32). Finally the question is answered by the aorist ἀπανάνατο (33).

31. μιν

The mss. read μιν. There are many passages where our mss. unanimously have μιν, many where they unanimously read νιν (including lines 26 and 52 of this ode), as there are quite a few (especially in the Olympian and Pythian odes for which we have more mss.) where they are divided.[133] Papyri do not offer a clearer picture: in *Pae.*6.115, 7b.46, *fr.*128e(a).7, 169a.23 the papyrus has μ *in linea*, and ν *supra lineam* or *post correctionem*; in *fr.*51f(c).5 it is the other way around; in *Pae.*8.72 one papyrus has μιν, another νιν. "Die im Papyrus über μιν stehende Variante ν(ιν) zeigt, daß die Ortho-

---

[131] Cf. preceding note.
[132] See Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 22-5.
[133] For more details see Braswell on *P.*4.79 (p. 176) and Slater *s.vv.* μιν and νιν where the existence of a variant reading is conveniently indicated.

graphie dieser Form bei Pindar schon früh umstritten war," Radt, *Zweiter u. Sechster Paian*, p. 163.[134] Modern editors are divided in two camps. Some go with the mss. "Le plus sage est de suivre les manuscrits," Des Places, *Pronom*, p. 24, followed by Turyn and others.[135] Boeckh and Tycho Mommsen were to first[136] to 'Doricize' all instances of μιν to νιν, on the authority of Apollonius Dyscolus ("Ιωνες διὰ τοῦ μ̄, Δωριεῖς δὲ διὰ τοῦ ν̄, p. 84.6 R. Schneider). They are followed by Bergk, Schroeder, Snell-Maehler, Bowra, and others. But, first, the disagreement in the papyri may be an indication that the division according to dialects was not as clear as Apollonius has it. Second, Pindar's dialect is a hybrid; it is a amalgam of Doric, epic, Aeolic and other forms. The tendency to 'Doricize' is based on the wrong presupposition. Braswell on *P.*4.79 (p. 176), pleads in favour of normalizing to νιν because attempts to explain the distribution of μιν and νιν have failed. Our ignorance is a reason exactly for *not* meddling with the text whenever the tradition is unanimous.

32. τοῖο δ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι

'Her steep words stimulated his feeling.' Referring to a story participant in the marked position directly before δέ is a common means of effecting *topic shift*:[137] after we have heard about Hippolyta's vamping the focus shifts to Peleus' reaction. ὀργὰν κνίζον is quite ambiguous as it stands. ὀργά denotes any uncontrolled emotional response; it may refer to all kinds of feeling.[138] κνίζω can be used to refer to stimulating both pleasant and unpleasant feelings. The Greek is no more specific than 'her steep words stimulated his feeling.' In the context about Hippolyta's attempts to seduce Peleus it could mean two things: either 'her steep words roused his anger' or 'her steep words stimulated his lust.'[139] The former interpretation is commonly adopt-

---

[134] See also Barrett, *Dionysiaca*, p. 19 n. 29.

[135] Radt (p. 163) proposes the following policy for the papyri: "Man darf die erstgeschriebene Lesart als die bessere betrachten, wie ja auch bei den Epinikien in den meisten Zweifelsfällen die besseren Handschriften μιν bieten."

[136] Ahlwardt first changed one μιν to νιν. See Gerber, *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 31, 1984, pp. 6/7. The errors in Snell-Maehler's apparatus Gerber points out have been corrected in the more recent reprints, except for *P.*3.29, where μιν is still in the text of the 8th edition (1987).

[137] This is one of the examples proving that in Greek *topic* and grammatical subject are in principle different categories.

[138] Cf. τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν εἶπε πολλάκις κακόν, | τὸ δ' ἐσθλόν· ὀργὴν δ' ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοίην ἔχει, Sem.*fr.*7.10/1 W (cf. *ibid.* 42).

[139] 'Her steep words roused his anger': (Jason speaks to Pelias:) ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένες ὠκύτεραι | κέρδος αἰνῆσαι πρὸ δίκας δόλιον τραχεῖαν ἑρπόντων πρὸς ἔπιβδαν ὅμως· | ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρὴ καὶ σὲ θεμισσαμένους ὀργὰς ὑφαίνειν λοιπὸν ὄλβον, *P.*4.139-41; πότερόν νιν (*sc.* Clytaemnestra) ἄρ' Ἰφιγένει' ... | ἔκνιξεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον, *P.*11.22/3. 'Her steep words stimulated his lust': καὶ ἔν τε θεοῖς τοῦτο κἀνθρώποις

ed,[140] but the Greek as it stands lends itself to the latter perfectly well: the interpretation 'her steep words roused his anger and immediately he scorned her out of fear for Zeus' anger' is just as plausible as 'her steep words stimulated his lust, but immediately he repulsed her out of fear for Zeus' anger.' Whatever the primary effect of her words was, he immediately rejected her, out of fear for Zeus' wrath. δέ in line 33 leaves implicit whether Peleus' rejection of Hippolyta was a consequence of his primary reaction or in antithesis with it, thus maintaining the ambiguity (see introduction, pp. 26-30). This polyinterpretability is functional on three levels. First, Pindar grants his audience the pleasure of having their own fantasies about Peleus' response to an attactive woman coming on to him. Ambiguities work well in erotic contexts. The veiled allusion to Peleus' lust saves this episode from an excess of virtue. Second, the ambiguity is convincing on the level of Pindar's psychological portrayal of his main character. Advances of an appealing woman in a situation where they are inappropriate may evoke a blend of mixed feelings, strong and uncontrollable, ranging from lust to anger. Third and most importantly, the allusion to Peleus' lust for Hippolyta confirms that she was a very attractive woman (cf. ἁβρά, 26, with my note). This is functional on the level of Pindar's thematic concerns, in that it is meant to increase our admiration for Peleus: it is easy to respect divine laws when violating them means giving in to an unattractive woman; but this was a horse of a different colour.

The image in **αἰπεινός**, 'steep,'[141] is not quite clear. In σοφίαι μέν | αἰπειναί, *O.*9.107/8, the image is from climbing; the *suppressed tenor* is 'difficult, hard to reach,' the *ground* being based on the fact that a steep mountain is hard to climb.[142] Perhaps here too Pindar means

---

ὁμῶς | αἰδέοντ' ἀμφαδὸν ἁδείας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶς. | καὶ γὰρ σέ, τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν ψευδεῖ θιγεῖν, | ἔτραπε μείλιχος ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον, *P.*9.40-3; καὶ γὰρ | ἑτέροις ἑτέρων ἔρωτες ἔκνιξαν φρένας, *P.*10.59/60, cf. τὸν δὲ Ἀρίστωνα ἔκνιξε ἄρα τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ἔρως, Hdt.6.62; εἴ σε μὴ κνίζοι λέχος, E.*Med.*568.

[140] E.g. 'her steep words stung him to anger', Bowra, *The Odes of Pindar* (transl.), p.39; 'But his mood was stung by her sheer words, and forthwith he repelled the bride', Bury *ad loc.*; 'Her bold language stung him to wrath', Sandys. The only scholar known to me who recognizes this polyinterpretability is Jacob Stern, 'The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5', *CPh* 66, 1971, 171/2.

[141] Cf. τὸν μονοκρήπιδα πάντως ἐν φυλακᾶι σχεθέμεν μεγάλαι, | εὖτ' ἂν αἰπεινῶν ἀπὸ σταθμῶν ἐς εὐδείελον | χθόνα μόληι κλειτᾶς Ἰαολκοῦ, | ξεῖνος αἴτ' ὦν ἀστός, *P.*4.75-8, 'from the steep dwellings'; Πυθῶνος αἰπεινᾶς, *N.*9.5; Ἰλίου αἰπεινῆς, *Il.*9.419, 682, cf. 15.257.

[142] For the idea cf. ἔστι τις λόγος | τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναίειν δυσαμβάτοις' ἐπὶ πέτραις, | †νῦν δέ μιν θοαν† χῶρον ἁγνὸν ἀμφέπειν · | οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροισι θνατῶν | ἔσοπτος, ᾧι μὴ δακέθυμος ἱδρὼς | ἔνδοθεν μόληι, | ἵκηι τ' ἐς ἄκρον ἀνδρείας, Sim.*fr.*37 D. (58 B., 386 Page).

to say that Hippolyta's words were difficult, in the sense that they were 'hard to cope with'—i.e. difficult not to yield to, or difficult to accept—, like a steep mountain is hard to cope with for the one who wants to climb it. Alternatively the *suppressed tenor* may be 'dangerous,' the *ground* being that steep mountains are dangerous for those who climb them.[143] Hippolyta's words could be characterized as bringing Peleus in a dangerous situation, because he ran the risk of yielding to them and acting against the laws of Zeus Xeinios.

κνίζω is 'stimulate by touching,' 'tickle,' or 'sting.'[144] Cf. τὰ δὲ παιδία, ἔςτ' ἂν γένωνται τετταράκοντα ἡμερῶν, ἐγρηγορότα μὲν οὔτε γελᾶι οὔτε δακρύει...οὐδὲ κνιζόμενα τὰ πολλὰ αἰςθάνεται, τὸ δὲ πλεῖςτον καθεύδει τοῦ χρόνου, Arist.*HA*.587^{b}7; (Kokkale is astonished by the liveliness of a painting by Apelles [72/3] on which a naked boy is portrayed:) τὸν παῖδα δὴ ⟨τὸν⟩ γύμνον ἢν κνίcω τοῦτον | οὐκ ἕλκος ἕξει; Herod.4.59/60, 'when I tickle this naked boy, don't you think that he will bleed?', he is so tender that he will show a wale at the first caress. The verb is metaphorically used to refer to stimulating emotions, pleasant: ἁδεῖα δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις, *I*.6.50; καὶ γὰρ | ἑτέροις ἑτέρων ἔρωτες ἔκνιξαν φρένας, *P*.10.59/60, cf. τὸν δὲ 'Αρίςτωνα ἔκνιξε ἄρα τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ἔρως, Hdt.6.62; εἴ ςε μὴ κνίζοι λέχος, E.*Med*.568; or unpleasant: (c.inf.) πότερόν νιν (*sc.* Clytaemnestra) ἄρ' 'Ιφιγένει'...| ἔκνιξεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρςαι χόλον, *P*.11.22/3; (abs.) (Euadne gave birth to Iamos) τὸν μὲν κνιζομένα λεῖπε χαμαί, *O*.6.44; μὴ κόρος ἐλθὼν κνίςηι, *P*.8.32 (cf. my note, pp. 510-2); cf. Hdt.7.10, 12, S.*OT* 786, E.*IA* 330.

•*Text:* The mss. read τοῦ δὲ ὀργάν. This gives an intolerable hiatus. No less than twelve different conjectures have been proposed in the past, including insertions of about every single monosyllabic particle available after or in the place of δέ (see Gerber, *Emendations*, p. 109). Gottfr. Hermann's τοῖο δ' presupposes a very common corruption and is in all its simplicity certainly correct.

33. εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν

Peleus 'rejected the married woman immediately.' The aorist closes the narrative sequence about the true state of affairs (introduced by γάρ in 31): Peleus' rejection of Hippolyta is the point to which the story was leading. And now finally we have the complete picture and understand Hippolyta's motif for planning revenge on Peleus.

---

[143] Slater (p. 20, *s.v.*) gives 'repugnant, distasteful' as the *suppressed tenor*, which makes sense in the context; it is, however, when the adjective is interpreted in this way, impossible to give a satisfying description of the *ground*. The same objection goes for the translation of LSJ, 'wicked'; their alternative 'hasty' gives less problems concerning the formulation of the *ground*—for one can imagine that it is not easy to go slowly down a steep slope—, but it does not make sense in the context.

[144] Presumably the verb is derived from (or at least related to) the noun κνίδη, 'nettle.'

νύμφα is a well-chosen word: it combines its denotation 'bride, married woman,' i.e., the reason why Hippolyta's behaviour is unacceptable, with connotations of physical attractiveness (a νύμφα is a young, 'ready,' woman), which is the reason why her behaviour was dangerous for Peleus.

Heroes do things 'at once.' The heroic ideal values an immediate response to a situation, not cautious reflection.[145] Heroes do not need to waste much time in deliberation. Cf. also ἐν τάχει in line 35 below: Peleus' prompt rejection of Hippolyta is matched by an equally prompt reward from Zeus.

For the heroic (and divine) promptitude of action cf., e.g., ὣϲ ἔφατ, οὐδ' ἀπίθηϲεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν 'Αγαμέμνων. | αὐτίκα κηρύκεϲϲι...κέλευϲε κτλ, *Il.*2.441/2; Κάλχαϲ δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευε, *Il.*2.322; ἔννεπε δ' ἀντίον ὁρμαίνων τέραϲ εὐθὺϲ 'Απόλλων, *O.*8.41; ἀναβαὶϲ δ' εὐθὺϲ ἐνόπλια χαλκωθεὶϲ ἔπαιζεν, *O.*13.86; μῆτιν ἑὰν | εὐθὺϲ ἀμείβετο, *P.*9.38/9; τάχα δ' εὐθὺϲ ἰών, *P.*4.83, of Jason's confident first appearance in the market place in Iolcus (cf. Braswell *ad loc.*, p. 179, comparing A.R.1.784-6 and contrasting A.R.3.422 ff.[146]); ταχέωϲ δ' Ἄδματοϲ ἷκεν καὶ Μέλαμποϲ, *P.*4.126; αἶψα δ' ἀπὸ κλιϲιᾶν | ὦρτο, *P.*4.134/5; τάχα δὲ...| ἦλθον, *P.*4.171/2; αὐτίκα δ' .. | ἔννεπεν, *P.*4.241/2; αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ μεγάρων Χίρωνα προϲήνεπε φωνᾶι, *P.*9.29; ἔϲταϲεν γὰρ ἅπαντα χορὸν | ἐν τέρμαϲιν αὐτίκ' ἀγῶνοϲ, *P.*9.114; *N.*10.63-6, etc. It is illuminating that Hector's cautious reflections about how to respond to the situation in *Il.*22.99-130 mark the turning point for him and introduce his down-fall; cf. the two contrasting similees (93-5, 139-42). For **ἀπαναίνομαι**, 'spurn, reject,' cf. *Il.*7.185, *Od.*10.297, Hp.*Mul.*2.179; cf. also A.*Eu.*972. The simplex is more common. Cf. *Il.*7.93; *Il.*9.676, *Od.*3.265, 4.651, 13.287, etc.; for Pindar: *Pae.*4.35-7.

33-34. ξεινίου πατρὸϲ χόλον | δείϲαιϲ

With the postposed aorist participle clause the narrator provides an external motivation for the behaviour of his character[147]: Peleus rejected Hippolyta 'out of fear for the anger of Zeus Xeinios.' If Peleus had fallen for Hippolyta's advances he would have violated the mutual agreements between guest and host, guarded by Ζεὺϲ Ξείνιοϲ, as he would have done harm to his host Acastus, by whom he was purified. Peleus' respect for the laws of Zeus Xeinios is central to Pindar's thematic concerns. In line 8 Aegina is praised for its ξενία

[145] Cf. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, pp. 113-7; Braswell on *P.*4.34 (pp. 112/3).

[146] "It was Apollonius' Iason who provided a model for Virgil's reflective and often hesistant Aeneas," Braswell *loc. cit.*

[147] Cf. "The effect of postposing an AS participial clause is that it provides the reader with additional information without incorporating it into the sequence of events that makes up the main narrative," Sicking, *Semantics of the Verb*, p. 51.

is an emphatic way (see my note, pp. 111/2). In the following lines Thetis is presented as Peleus' reward for abiding by the divine laws of ξενία. This is what the myth wants to illustrate. See further interpretation, pp. 62-88.

For Zeus Xeinios, cf. ἔνθα (*sc.* on Aegina) cώτειρα Διὸc ξενίου | πάρεδροc ἀcκεῖται Θέμιc | ἔξοχ' ἀνθρώπων, *O.*8.21-3; ξεινίου Διὸc ἀcκεῖται θέμιc αἰξεναώοιc | ἐν τραπέζαιc, *N.*11.8/9. See also Farnell, *Cults*, I, pp. 73/4. For πατήρ, see my note on line 10 (p. 114).

34-41

He took good notice of it and he approved from heaven, the cloud-maker Zeus, King of Immortals, that soon he would achieve that a sea-goddess, one of the Nereids with golden spindle, would become his wife, after having persuaded her brother-in-law Poseidon, who often comes from Aegae to the famous Dorian Isthmus. There cheerful companies welcome him, the god, with the peal of pipes, and they compete with the bold strength of their limbs. Inborn destiny decides over everything.

According to the traditional story, told by Pindar in *I.*8, Thetis was given to Peleus for practical reasons. On the advice of Themis, Zeus chose Peleus to be the husband of the Nereid Thetis, although Zeus himself was not completely insensitive to her charms and would have liked to enjoy her himself, and the same was true for Poseidon (Ζεὺc ὅτ' ἀμφὶ Θέτιδοc ἀγλαόc τ' ἔριcαν Ποcειδὰν γάμωι, | ἄλοχον εὐειδέα θέλων ἑκάτεροc | ἑὰν ἔμμεν· ἔρωc γὰρ ἔχεν, *I.*8.30-2; Apollod.3.13.5; cf. line 37). They were, however, discouraged by a prophecy that a son born to Thetis would become more powerful than his father. Moreover, Thetis had proved herself unwilling to yield to Zeus' advances: it would serve her well to be compelled to marry a mortal.[148] Hera was, of course, content with Zeus' decision to match Thetis with Peleus, summoned all Olympians to the wedding, and send Iris to Cheiron's cave with an order for Peleus to make ready (*I.*8.30-52; A.R.4.790-809).

Here there is no hint whatsoever to Zeus' practical motifs for giving Thetis away to Peleus. The prophecy is not mentioned. Here Pindar presents Thetis as Peleus' very special reward for respecting the laws of Zeus Xeinios. Mentioning the prophecy would detract from the value of this reward. The rivalry between Zeus and

---

148 Τινὲc δὲ λέγουcι Θέτιν μὴ βουληθῆναι Διὶ cυνελθεῖν ὡc ὑπὸ Ἥραc τραφεῖcαν, Διὰ δὲ ὀργιcθέντα θνητῶι θέλειν αὐτὴν cυνοικίcαι, Apollod.3.13.5; cf. A.R.4.790-8.

Poseidon for Thetis' favours is alluded to (37), for this emphasizes Peleus' very special privilege.

34. ὁ δ' εὖ φράcθη

'He (Zeus) took good notice' of Peleus' respect for his laws. Referring to a story participant with a pronoun in the marked position directly before δέ is a very common means of effecting *topic shift*. ὁ δέ thus, as a rule, refers to 'the other.' 'The other' here is the last male person mentioned, viz. Zeus. He is identified as such at the end of the main sentence. Cf. my note on *P*.8.48 (pp. 535/6).

For the medio-passive of **φράζω**, 'indicate to oneself', i.e. 'take notice of,' cf. εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον, | ἄλλοιcι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ, ψυχὰν 'Αΐδαι τελέων οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἄνευθεν, *I*.1.67/8; ὄφρ' ἄλλην φράζωνται ἐνὶ φρεcὶ μῆτιν ἀμείνω, *Il*.9.423; ἀλλὰ μάλ' εὔκηλος τὰ φράζεαι, ἅcc' ἐθέληcθα, *Il*.1.554; ἀλλά c' ἄνωγα | φράζεcθαι τάδε πάντα μετὰ φρεcίν, ὡc ἀγορεύω, Hes.*Op*.687/8; ἐφράcθη καὶ ἐc θυμὸν ἐβάλετο, Hdt.1.84, etc.

34-35. κατένευcέν τέ οἱ ὀρcινεφὴc ἐξ οὐρανοῦ | Ζεὺc ἀθανάτων βαcιλεύc

The weighty titles emphasize that it was the King of the Immortals himself who granted Peleus Thetis as his reward. **κατανεύω** is 'nodding one's head downwards,' as a sign of approval. Cf. (Ζεὺc) κατένευcέν τέ οἱ χαίταιc, ἀριcτεύοιcαν εὐκάρπου χθονὸc | Cικελίαν πίειραν ὀρθώcειν κορυφαῖc πολίων ἀφνέαιc, *N*.1.14/5; cf. also *O*.7.67, *P*.1.71, *I*.8.46. For the construction see next note.

ὀρcινεφήc, 'who rouses the clouds,' is a *hapax*. In *O*.10.81 Zeus gets the epithet ὀρcίκτυποc (also an *hapax*). ὀρcοτρίαινα is a common epithet for Poseidon (*O*.8.48, *P*.2.12, *N*.4.86, *Pae*.9.47). Other epithets for Zeus associating him with clouds are: ὑψινεφήc, *O*.5.17, and κελαινεφήc, *Pae*.6.55, 12.9. Cf. also *N*.3.10, where the text is not totally certain (see comm. *ad loc*.). These are all, of course, reminiscent of the Homeric formula νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύc (*Il*.1.517, etc.). For Zeus' royalty cf. *N*.10.16, *O*.7.34, *N*.7.82, *I*.8.20, *O*.13.24-6, *N*.1.13/4, *Pae*.6.94, etc.

35-36. ὥcτ' ἐν τάχει | ποντίαν χρυcαλακάτων τινὰ Νηρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν

Zeus approved that Peleus 'would soon achieve that a sea-goddess, one of the Nereids with golden distaff would be his wife.' Thetis will be the one, as everyone in the audience knew and as lines 22-6 have reminded us.

In early Greek **πράccω** in the active with a direct object means 'effecting, bringing about.'[149]

---

[149] The usage with objects referring to the route via which one travels in the sense of 'passing through, over' (πρήccουcι κέλευθον, *Od*.13.83; 9.491, *Il*.14.282, 23.501,

Cf., e.g., πρῆξαι δ' ἔμπης οὔ τι δυνήςεαι, *Il.*1.562; οὐδέ τι ἔργον | ἐνθάδ' ἔτι πρήξει, *Od.*19.323/4; μάχαι λεόντεςςιν ἀγροτέροις ἔπραςςεν φόνον, *N.*3.46. Often 'bringing about for oneself': in τὸν δὲ τετράκναμον ἔπραξε δεςμὸν | ἑὸν ὄλεθρον ὄγ', *P.*2.40/1, Ixion 'effected' his bondage (i.e., he brought it upon him) by attempting to seduce Hera. Elsewhere in Pindar often of athletic success: εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάναι τε χαρεὶς | καὶ πόνωι πράςςει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς, *I.*6.10/1; ὁ μέν που τεοῖς τε μήδεςι τοῦτ' ἔπραξεν, *P.*10.11, *sc.* a victory; Δὶ τοῦτ' Ἐνυαλίωι τ' ἐκδώςομεν πράςςειν, *O.*13.106, *sc.* future victories; ἔν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοιςι ποθεινὸν | κλέος ἔπραξεν, *I.*5.7/8.

Here πράξειν goes with a personal object; ἄκοιτιν specifies the state that will be 'brought about.' Peleus will 'effect' that one of the Nereids will be his wife. For the implied activity on Peleus' part cf. *N.*3.35/6 with my note (pp. 317/8).

There are four Pindaric examples of consecutive **ὥςτε** with an infinitive, of which three are to be found in this ode: *h.l.*, 1, 50; *O.*9.74 is the other one. The construction found here, κατένευςεν ὥςτε with a future infinitive, is unusual. Ruijgh, *Autour de "τε épique"*, p. 981, followed by Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 345/6, explains it as a contamination of κατένευςεν ὥςτε πρᾶξαι and κατένευςεν πράξειν (cf. *N.*1.14/5, *O.*7.67/8, *Il.*10.393). A motif for inserting the (strictly speaking redundant) ὥςτε may be the sheer length of the sentence. ὥςτε neatly articulates the sentence, seperating the two lengthy noun phrases that circumscribe Zeus and Thetis respectively, thus facilitating the linear perception of the text for a listening audience.

ἐν τάχει is an equivalent of an adverb (e.g. ταχέως).[150] Peleus' immediate rejection of Hippolyta is matched by a quick response on Zeus' part (cf. my note on line 33 above).

χρυςηλάκατος, 'with golden distaff,' is a fixed epithet of Artemis (*Il.*20.70, etc., B.10.38, S.*Tr.*637); used of the Graces at B.8.1. In χρυςαλακάτοιο πόςις | Ἀμφιτρίτας, *O.*6.104/5, the epithet is, like *h.l.*, applied to a Nereid. In χρυςαλάκατον Μελίαν, *fr.*29.1, it is used for an Oceanid. Cf.

---

*h.Merc.*203, etc.) is confined to epic diction; in these passages too the terminative connotations of the verb are recognizable. The usage of πράςςω in the active with a direct object without terminative connotations, in the sense of 'busying oneself with, managing,' i.e., with emphasis on the subject's activity in the field of what the direct object refers to rather than on his 'effectuation' of what the direct object refers to (as in πράττειν τὰ πολιτικά, Pl.*Ap.*31d, *Smp.*216a, Lys.16.20, etc.; cὺ μὲν τὰ cαυτῆς πρᾶςς', S.*El.*678; Pl.*Phdr.*247a, *Plt.*307e, *R.*433a, 452c, etc.) is not to be found in early Greek and seems to be a particularity of the Attic dialect.

150 Cf. A.*Ag.*1240, 1448, *Pr.*747, S.*OT* 765, 1131, *El.*16, 387, *OC* 500, Th.1.86, etc. Cf. also expressions like διὰ τάχους (S.*Aj.*822, Th.1.63, etc.), εἰς τάχος (X.*Eq.*3.5, Ar.*Ach.*686, etc.), κατὰ τάχος (Hdt.1.124, 152, Th.1.73, etc.), μετὰ τάχους (Pl.*Prt.*332b), and cὺν τάχει (S.*Aj.*853, *OC* 885, 904, etc.).

also χρυcαλακάτου...Λατοῦc, *N.*6.36/7[151], *fr.*128c.1. For gold as an emblem of divinity see my note on line 24 above (p. 139); cf. also χρυcεᾶν Νηρηΐδων, line 7. For **ποντίαν** see my note on *N.*3.35 (p. 318).

Strophe Γ

37. γαμβρὸν Ποcειδάωνα πείcαιc

The reference to Zeus' persuading Poseidon is meant to conjure up the two great gods' rivalry for Thetis. Cf. Ζεὺc ὅτ' ἀμφὶ Θέτιδοc ἀγλαόc τ' ἔριcαν Ποcειδὰν γάμωι, | ἄλοχον εὐειδέα θέλων ἑκάτεροc | ἑὰν ἔμμεν· ἔρωc γὰρ ἔχεν, *I.*8.30-2 (cf. also Apollod.3.13.5). Peleus' hierogamy is presented as a reward for his behaviour. That the two great gods would have liked themselves to marry the girl he will get increases the value of his reward.[152]

The relevance of **γαμβρόν** is not quite clear. The noun refers to someone who is related to one by marriage.

Cf. Πηλέοc...εὐδαίμονοc γαμβροῦ θεῶν, *I.*6.25; φιάλαν ὡc εἴ τιc ἀφνείαc ἀπὸ χειρὸc ἑλὼν | ἔνδον ἀμπέλου καχλάζοιcαν δρόcωι | δωρήcεται | νεανίαι γαμβρῶι προπίνων οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε, κτλ, *O.*7.1-4, where γαμβρόc refers to the bridegroom from the perspective of the τιc who must be a member of the bride's family (probably her father). The noun may specifically refer to a 'son-in-law' (γαμβρὸc Ἥραc, *I.*4.60, of Heracles, who married Hebe, Hera's daughter; cf. also *Il.*6.249, Hdt.5.30, 67, etc.; perhaps thus also *O.*7.4), or to a 'brother-in-law' (cὺν δ' ἀέθλοιc ἐκέλευcεν διακρῖναι ποδῶν, | ἅντινα cχήcοι τιc ἡρώων, ὅcοι γαμβροί cφιν [*sc.* the Danaids] ἦλθον, *P.*9.115/6, 'who came to become their [and eachother's] family by marriage', in this case mutual brothers-in-law; in *Il.*5.474 and 13.464 it refers to a sister's husband; in S.*OT* 70 Oedipus calls Creon his γαμβρόc, as he is his wife's brother[153]).

The problem here is to determine whose γαμβρόc Poseidon is supposed to be. There seem to be three possibilities. (i) On first sight the fact that Zeus is the subject of πείcαιc seems to indicate that Poseidon is called Zeus' γαμβρόc. Although it is true that Hera is Poseidon's sister, it seems odd thus to emphasize the family-tie of Zeus and Poseidon, for Zeus and Poseidon were also brothers. (ii) More probably, γαμβρόν hints at Poseidon's marriage to the Nereid Amphitrite (*O.*6.105, Hes.*Th.*240ff., 930, B.1.8 with Maehler *ad loc.*, II p. 11). This makes him Thetis' γαμβρόc. The interpretation that Zeus persuaded Poseidon

---

[151] Codd.: χρυcοπλοκάμου Hermann.
[152] A reference to the prophecy (*I.*8.36-8) would have destroyed the effect.
[153] He is, of course, still unconstious of the fact that Creon is also his uncle.

in his capacity of Thetis' γαμβρός has the advantage of giving an internal motivation as to why deliberation with Poseidon was necessary (in addition to the poet's motivation for mentioning it, viz. their rivalry which increases her value): Poseidon would have had a say in this matter because he was related to Thetis.[154] We would, however, like to have a signal for dissociating the reference of the implied genitive adjunct with γαμβρόν from the grammatical subject of πείcαιc. (iii) The scholiast takes the clause to mean that Zeus persuaded Poseidon to become Peleus' γαμβρόc.[155] For the 'proleptic' contruction cf. ξυνᾶνα... πείcαιc', lines 27/8 above. This interpretation has the advantage of investing γαμβρόc with a relevance directly related to Peleus' future marriage and thus with the objective of Zeus' persuasion. However, the same grammatical objections as with (ii) seem to apply.

37. ὃc Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ κλειτὰν θαμὰ νίcεται Ἰcθμὸν Δωρίαν
The relative pronoun introduces the reference to Poseidon's voyages to the Isthmus as a casual association, inadvertently evoked by the preceding reference to the god. This is an example of the fictional imitation of spontaneous text production (see introduction, pp. 34-41). On the level of the poet's real compositional concerns, the reference to Poseidon has been carefully placed at the very end of his narrative in order to allow a smooth transition back to athletics, i.e., to his encomiastic program in its narrowest sense, via a brief description of athletic competition on the Isthmus.

Homer associates Poseidon with a city called **Aegae** in three passages (*Il.*8.203, 13.21, *Od.*5.381). This was either Aegae on the western shore of Euboea (either on the spot of the modern village Λίμνη, or somewhat further to the South, on the spot of the monastry 'Αγ. Νικολάου), known for its Poseidon sanctuary (Strab.9.405), or to Aegae on the northern shore of Achaea, near the Crathis estuary (Strab.8.386.5, Paus.7.25.12), one of the twelve traditional Ionic colonies in Greece (Hdt.7.145), a place today called Παραλία 'Ακράταc. The ancient commentators disagree about which Aegae Homer was referring to (cf. Strab.8.386, Eustath. *ad Il.*13.21 [III p. 430 Van der Valk] and *ad Il.*8.203 [II pp. 564/5 v.d.V.]). The Σ.*ad h.l.* (67a, III 95 Dr.) chooses for Aegae in Euboea.

The reference to Aegae, together with the choice of the epic verb νίcεται, gives this sentence an epic flavour. The fact that νίcεται Ἰcθμόν metrically represents a so-called heroic clausula,[156] may contribute to this effect.

---

[154] Thus also Farnell *ad loc.* (p. 277); Cole, *Pindar's Feasts*, p. 58. Cf. Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 54).

[155] πείcαc ὁ Ζεὺc cύγγαμβρον αὐτῶι γενέcθαι τὸν Ποcειδῶνα· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὴν Θέτιν, ὁ δὲ τὴν 'Αμφιτρίτην ἔγημεν, Σ. 67a (III 95 Dr.).

[156] Representing a hexametre from the so-called Bucolic diaeresis. This is the only

The usage of the verb **νίcομαι**, 'go, come,' is mainly confined to the Homeric poems (*Il.*12.119, 13.186, 15.557, 18.566, 23.76, *Od.*4.701, 5.19, 10.42) and Hesiod (*Th.*71, *Op.*237, *Sc.*469). Euripides uses it twice in lyric metres (*Hel.*1482, *Cyc.*43) and once in iambic trimetre (*Phoen.*1234, in a messenger-story, where epic words are not uncommon). For Pindar cf. καὶ νῦν ἐc ταύταν ἑορτὰν ἵλαοc...νίcεται, *O.*3.34; τᾶc (*sc.* Πίcαc) ἄπο | θεόμοροι νίcοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπουc ἀοιδαί, *O.*3.9/10. Cf. further A.R.2.824, Hermesian.7.65, Call.*fr.*1.45 P, Theoc.7.25.

θαμά means 'often' (Boeckh's suggestion that θαμά sometimes means 'simul, una' has been refuted by J.K. Ingram, 'On θαμά and θαμάκιc in Pindar', *Hermathena* 2, 1876, 217-27). The adverb is not unfrequent in Homer (*Il.*15.470, 16.207, *Od.*1.143, 209, 4.178, 686, 15.516, 16.27, 19.521), once attested in Hesiod (*Op.*362), and at least sixteen times in Pindar (*O.*1.17, [4.27], 7.12, *P.*3.78, 4.40, 12.25, *N.*1.17, 22, 2.9, 4.15, 7.97, *Pae.*2.98, 7B.49, 12.5, *fr.*70d(h).11, 140a.57, 187); cf. further B.12.193, 27.34, Alc.*fr.*72.6, 358.5 V, Anacr.*fr.*50.8 P, S.*El.*524, Ar.*Eq.*900, *Pl.*1166, Pl.*Phd.*72e, X.*Mem.*2.1.22.

Δώριοc is a standard qualification of the Isthmus: Ἰcθμίαν ἵπποιcι νίκαν, | τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποcειδάων ὀπάcαιc, | Δωρίων αὐτῶι cτεφάνωμα κόμαι | πέμπεν ἀναδεῖcθαι cελίνων, *I.*2.13-6; Ἴcθμιον ἂν νάποc | Δωρίων ἔλαχεν cελίνων, *I.*8.64. For the adjective in connection with Aegina see my note on *N.*3.3 (pp. 246/7).

38. ἔνθα μιν εὔφρονεc ἶλαι cὺν καλάμοιο βοᾶι θεὸν δέκονται

The welcoming (δέκονται) of the patron deity, Poseidon, on the opening day of the festival, a ceremony that included a sacrifice to the god.[157] See further interpretation, pp. 76-8.

An **ἴλη** (only here in Pindar) is a 'band, troop' of men, used in the militairy sense of 'company' of soldiers.

Cf. Cκυθέων τῶν νομάδων ἴλη ἀνδρῶν cταcιάcαcα ὑπεξῆλθε ἐc τὴν Μηδικήν, Hdt.1.73; κατὰ ἴλαc, Hdt.1.202; μία δ' ἐκ κλιcίαc ἀνδρῶν ἴλη | τὸν ὑπαcπίδιον κόcμον φερέτω, S.*Aj.*1407/8; οἱ δὲ παρήλαυνον τεταγμένοι κατ' ἴλαc καὶ κατὰ τάξειc, X.*An.*1.2.16. Cf. also ὡc τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλιcιάων |...ἐcτιχάοντο | ἰλαδὸν εἰc ἀγορήν, *Il.*2.91-3; τὴν μέν τοι κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔcτιν ἑλέcθαι | ῥηιδίωc, Hes.*Op.*287/8; cf. Hdt.1.172, Tyrt.23.13. Later the word becomes the *terminus technicus* for a company of the cavalry (Arr.*Tact.*18.2, Ascl.*Tact.*7.2, Plb.6.25.1, D.H.6.12, Plu.*Caes.*45, etc.; perhaps it is also used in this sense in X.*An.*1.2.16, *v.s.*). The noun is used metaphorically in λεόντων ἁ δαφοινὸc ἴλα, E.*Alc.*580/1.

---

instance in this poem where in the first verse of the strophe / antistrophe a word-ending after the 19th syllable is combined with a word-ending after the 24th syllable.

[157] That such a sacrifice took place can be concluded from οἱ φυγάδεc τῶν Κορινθίων ἐποίηcαν τῶι Ποcειδῶνι τὴν θυcίαν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα, X.*HG* 4.5.2; cf. also Philostr.*Im.*2.16.

Here ἶλαι is used metaphorically (i.e., in a non-military sense) of the 'masses' of athletes taking part in the opening ceremony.[158] The noun refers preeminently to well-ordered groups, so probably we are to think of some kind of organized ceremony; perhaps the athletes were grouped as delegations according to their home-πόλεις.[159]

μιν...θεόν: The pronoun makes for linear text-coherence and stresses θεόν, because after the pronoun the noun comes as a strictly speaking redundant reminder of Poseidon' divine stature. θεόν sheds light upon the nature of the action described by δέκονται: 'they welcomed him as a god', i.e., with a sacrifice.

For the double reference, cf. δὴ γάρ μιν ἔφαντ' ἐπιδήμιον εἶναι | ςὸν πατέρ', *Od.*1.194/5; ἥ μιν ἔγειρεν | Ναυςικάαν εὔπεπλον, *Od.*6.48/9 (cit. Dissen *ad loc.*); for Pindar: καί ῥά μιν χώραϲ ἀκλάρωτον λίπον | ἁγνὸν θεόν, *O.*7.59/60. For Mommsen's conjecture νιν, see my note on line 31 (pp. 154/5).

For **βοά** of musical instruments cf. φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέϲιν | Αἰνηϲιδάμου παιδὶ ϲυμμεῖξαι, *O.*3.8/9; παντᾶι δὲ χοροὶ παρθένων | λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν δονέονται, *P.*10.38/9. Cf. also *N.*3.67 with my note (pp. 375-8). For the **κάλαμοϲ** cf. *O.*10.84, *Pae.*9.36; cf. also *fr.*70 with Σ. on *P.*12.25 (44a). For Greek reed instruments see West, *Ancient Greek Music*, pp. 81-109; further references are to be found therein. For **δέκομαι ϲύν** cf. ϲὺν δὲ φιλοφροϲύναιϲ εὐηράτοιϲ Ἀγηϲία δέξαιτο κῶμον, *O.*6.98. Cf. also μειλιχίοιϲι λόγοιϲ αὐτοὺϲ Ἰάϲων δέγμενοϲ, *P.*4.128; τὸ δ' ἐλάϲιππον ἔθνοϲ ἐνδυκέωϲ | δέκονται θυϲίαιϲιν ἄνδρεϲ οἰχνέοντέϲ ϲφε δωροφόροι, *P.*5.86/6; ὃϲ εὐμενεῖ νόωι | Ξενάρκειον ἔδεκτο Κίρραθεν ἐϲτεφανωμένον | υἱόν, *P.*8.18-20; Λατόοϲ ἔνθα με παῖδεϲ | εὐμενεῖ δέξαϲθε νόωι θεράποντα | ὑμέτερον κελαδεννᾶι | ϲὺν μελιγάρυϊ παιᾶνοϲ ἀγακλέοϲ ὀμφᾶι, *Pae.*5.44-7.

39. καὶ ϲθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θραϲεῖ

'And they compete with the bold strength of their limbs,' a brief description of athletic competition in general, although the combination of strength and courage preeminently evokes associations with combat sports, the disciplines in which the present victor and his family specialized.

Pindar often refers to the victor's discipline by mentioning the part of the body, hand or foot, which is characteristic for that discipline,

---

[158] The εὔφρονεϲ ἶλαι are of course not the contestants in action. But for torch-races there were no team-sports in antiquity and εὐφρονία is not a very fruitful state of mind for a contestant in competition (cf. κακὰ φρονέων, *P.*8.82).

[159] If music necessarily implied dancing, it would be tempting to speculate that the various national delegations perfomed some kind of choral dance. Then the opening ceremony would neatly parallel the victory celebrations after the battle is lost and won.

cf. cὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶcαι cθένει, *N.*10.48 (see further my note on 19. χειρῶν βίαν, p. 128). Here cθένει γυίων has unspecific reference ('with bodily strenth'). For this phrase, cf. κρίνειν τα[χυτᾶτά τε] λαιψηρῶν ποδῶν | Ἕλλαcι καὶ γυ[ίων ἀ]ριcταλκὲc cθένοc, B.7.6/7.

γυῖον in the singular refers to a human 'body' (*N.*7.73). In the plural too it commonly refers to a single 'body,' apparently conceived as a plural notion, a compilation of limbs (*P.*3.52, *P.*4.80, *P.*4.253, *N.*4.5, *N.*8.38, *N.*11.46. Only in *O.*8.68 the plural necessarily refers to several (viz. four) bodies (cf. *P.*8.81/2).

θραcύc in Pindar combines connotations of bravery with connotations of being deterrent. Someone who is θραcύc is not afraid when in danger and scares his adversaries with his unstoppable courage. It is an unequivocally positive qualification for warriors and athletes; in other situations, however, θράcοc is a less fruitful and less commended state of mind. 'Bold' is probably the closest English equivalent. Although θραcύc does have connotations of 'wildness,' it does not refer specifically to boldness with the exclusion of reflection, to stupid bravery, as it does in later authors.[160]

In φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖc | μυρίαιc ἔργων θραcέων ἕνεκεν, *N.*10.2/3, the fame of Argos is said to be a result of her deeds that were θραcύc. In *P.*10.44-8 the fact that Peleus is θραcείαι πνέων καρδίαι results in him killing Medusa and striking the people of Seriphos dead in stone. In *I.*6.43-9 Heracles prays to Zeus for Telamon to get a παῖδα θραcύν (45), a man ἄρρηκτον φυάν (47); his prayers are answered and Telamon gets Ajax, a notoriously brave man. In *Pae.*6.86 Paris' killing of Achilles is called a θραcὺc φόνοc; it takes courage to kill the best of the Greeks. The same applies to the noun in: εὐανθέα δ' ἀναβάcομαι cτόλον ἀμφ' ἀρετᾶι | κελαδέων. νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράcοc | δεινῶν πολέμων· ὅθεν φαμὶ καὶ cὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, *P.*2.62-4, courage in war helps to win infinite renown.

In Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διόc τ' ἐκγόνων θραcύ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν | φαενναῖc ἀρεταῖc ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων | οἴκοθεν· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαυcιc ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργωι, *N.*7.50-2, Pindar says that it would be θραcύ for him to tell of all the deeds of the Aeacids from the beginning; this attitude would not contribute to his present aims, as the following sentence explains. Sometimes the connotation 'wild, deterrent' is predominant. In *P.*12.7 the Gorgons are called θραcεῖαι. In *I.*1.13 the fabulous dogs of the monster Geryon are called θραcεῖαι. In *P.*2.83 the noun θράcοc is used to refer to the atti-

---

[160] See, e.g., Plato's *Laches*, where it is opposed to ἀνδρεῖοc; see esp. ἀλλ' οἶμαι τὸ ἄφοβον καὶ τὸ ἀνδρεῖον οὐ ταὐτόν ἐcτιν. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀνδρείαc μὲν καὶ προμηθίαc πάνυ τιcὶν ὀλίγοιc οἶμαι μετεῖναι, θραcύτητοc δὲ καὶ τόλμηc καὶ τοῦ ἀφόβου μετὰ ἀπρομηθίαc πάνυ πολλοῖc καὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ παίδων καὶ θηρίων. ταῦτ' οὖν ἃ cὺ καλεῖc ἀνδρεῖα καὶ οἱ πολλοί, ἐγὼ θραcέα καλῶ, ἀνδρεῖα δὲ τὰ φρόνιμα περὶ ὧν λέγω, 197b1-c1. Pindar does not use the words ἀνδρεῖοc and ἀνδρείαν.

tude of devious citizens, who fawn upon all, weaving fine threads of mischief.

For θραcύc in a context of Games and athletics, cf. Κλειτομάχοιο νίκαν Ἰcθμοῖ θραcύγυιον, *P.*8.37. The combination of strength and courage is often said to effect successes at the games. Cf. ὃc ἂν χερcὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήcαιc | τὰ μέγιcτ' ἀέθλων ἕληι τόλμαι τε καὶ cθένει, *P.*10.23/4; *O.*1.96 (*v.i.*), etc.

For **ἐρίζομαι** of athletic competition cf. τὸ δὲ κλέοc | τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοιc | Πέλοποc, ἵνα ταχυτὰc ποδῶν ἐρίζεται | ἀκμαί τ' ἰcχύοc θραcύπονοι, *O.*1.93-6; *I.*4.28/9, *I.*5.4-6[161]; cf. also *Il.*13.325. **καί** coordinates two sentences referring to actions taking place successively. The latter is, however, a natural sequel to the former: after the opening ceremony the Games take place. As the εὔφρομεc ἶλαι refer to well-ordered groups of athletes in an opening ceremony, there is continuity of *topic* and of subject.

40-41. πότμοc δὲ κρίνει cυγγενὴc ἔργων πέρι | πάντων
'Inborn (inherited) destiny decides over all things.' For the sentiment see further my note on *N.*3.40-2 (pp. 324-8). For the relevance of the *gnome* in the present context, see interpretation, pp. 78, 86.

In Homer **πότμοc** is always 'evil destiny, doom', especially death.[162] In Pindar πότμοc is, like τύχα and δαίμων, neutral in that it can be used for positive and negative fate alike.[163] In general, the Pindaric πότμοc, unlike τύχα and δαίμων, does not refer to fortune as a temporarily punctual, or momentary intervention of fate, but rather as the permanent destiny of each man, one's 'lot in life.'

Cf. ἐφαμερίαν οὐκ εἰδότεc οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκταc | ἄμμε πότμοc | ἄντιν' ἔγραψε δραμεῖν ποτὶ cτάθμαν, *N.*6.6/7. It is, like *h.l.*, 'inborn, inherited' in νῦν δ' αὖτιc ἀρχαίαc ἐπέβαcε πότμοc | cυγγενὴc εὐαμερίαc, *I.*1.39/40; cf. also πατρώϊον |...πότμον, *O.*2.35/6. πότμοc keeps an eye on men: λαγέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρκεται, | εἴ τιν' ἀνθρώπων, ὁ μέγαc πότμοc, *P.*3.85/6. In ὔμμε δ' ἐκλάρωcεν πότμοc | Ζηνὶ γενεθλίωι, *O.*8.15/6, the protection of Zeus is supposed to be permanent in so far as he is the ancestor of the Aeginetans. In μὴ καθέλοι μιν αἰὼν πότμον ἐφαωψαιc | ὀρφανὸν γενεᾶc, *O.*9.60/1, childlessness is a permanent fate and can be ascribed to πότμοc. Also in ἀναπνέομεν δ' οὐχ ἅπαντεc ἐπὶ ἴcα· | εἴργει δὲ πότμωι

---

[161] The middle in these examples is rightly explained as 'reciprocal' ('swift feet contending [against feet], ships contending [against ships]', etc.) by Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, New York 1900-11, I 66/7; see also Gerber *ad O.*1.95.

[162] Cf. e.g. θάνατον καὶ πότμον ἐπίcπηι, *Il.*2.359, 20.337; οὐ γάρ πώ τοι μοῖρα θανεῖν καὶ πότμον ἐπιcπεῖν, 7.52, cf. 6.412, *Od.*2.250, 4.562; ὃc πᾶcι μνηcτῆρcιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήcω, 19.550, cf. *Il.*4.396, etc.

[163] The Homeric usage of πότμοc occurs in χάλκαcπιc ὧι πότμον Ἄρηc ἔμειξεν, *I.*7.25, and in the expression τὸ ταχύποτμον ... ἀνέρων ἔθνοc, *O.*1.66 (perhaps modeled on the Homeric ὠκύμοροc, see Gerber *ad loc.*).

ζυγένθ' ἕτερον ἕτερα, *N.*7.5/6, where things under the yoke of πότμος are said to be responsible for the limitations of each man, πότμος refers to the life-long fate of man. See also Thummer, *Religiosität*, 99/100.

συγγενής indicates that what is qualified by it 'goes with the γένος,' i.e., that it is 'inborn, inherited' (cf. *O.*13.13, *N.*1.28, *N.*3.40, *P.*10.12, *N.*6.8, *P.*5.16, *I.*1.40).

41-46

You, Euthymenes, have fallen twice in the arms of Victory in Aegina and touched elaborate hymns. Really, having rushed after you, Pytheas, now also your uncle does honour to that hero's (i.e., Peleus') kindred race (i.e., the Aeginetans). Nemea is firmly fixed, as well as the local month dear to Apollo. At home he (you?) conquered all of his (your) own age who came, as well as in the fine vale of Nisus' hill.

41. τὺ δ' ..., Εὐθύμενες

With the address to Euthymenes the poet returns to his encomiastic duty in its narrowest sense, which is to praise the victor and his family. However, there is no signal indicating that the song of the Muses, which started with ὡς in 26, ends here (see interpretation, pp. 71-3, 79/80).

Euthymenes was a maternal uncle of Pytheas (μάτρως, 43; *I.*6.58-62). Like Pytheas, he was a pancratiast (*I.*6.60, *I.*5.19). His palmares so far includes only two victories at local Aeginetan games, mentioned in this line (see next note). After the performance of this ode, however, he won two Isthmian victories and at least one (and therefore probably only one) Nemean victory, witnessing ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου | τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας, | ἀγλαοὶ παῖδές τε καὶ μάτρως, *I.*6.60-2, for Pytheas' younger brother Phylacidas. After 480 B.C. his athletic career stopped with all probability. He is not even mentioned in *I.*5, the second ode for Phylacidas, for which the latest possible date is 478 B.C. For more details see my article in *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32.

In *P.*8.61 τὺ δ' is used in a very similar way: it serves to mark the transition from the myth (39-56), including some sort of an epilogue (56-60), to the patron deity of the Games where the victor has won. In *P.*2.57 τὺ δέ marks the transition from the myth (21-48) and following *gnomae*, to the person of the victor. In *I.*7.31 τὺ δέ marks the return to the person of the victor after a short gnomic passage (26-30). In *O.*1.85 and *P.*8.8 no transition or incision at all is marked by τὺ δέ. In *P.*8.8 not even *topic-switch* occurs (see p. 479).

Pindar uses both the Doric form τύ and the Ionian-epic and Lesbian form σύ. The Doric form is the rule; σύ only occurs if the following word

begins with a τ or θ: cύ τοι, *P*.5.6, 6.19; also after the insertion of καί: ἀλλὰ cὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ, *O*.10.3. This also applies to the dative (normally τοι, but cf. cοι τιμᾶι, *P*.4.270; cοι τούτων, *N*.10.85; cοί τε, *fr*.155.1; the only passage where avoidance of alliteration does not account for the sigmatic form is νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνιά cοι Λιβύα | δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν, *P*.9.55/6). Such avoidance of a close succession of voiceless dentals is to a certain extent comparable with the avoidance of a close succession of *gammas*, as in αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω, *Il*.1.333, 8.446 (see C.J. Ruijgh, *L' élément achéen dans la langue grecque*, 37) and cf. the puzzling τε in τῆνδε τε γαῖαν, *Od*.13.238, 15.484; τόνδε τ' ἐγώ, 15.546, where one would expect γε (see C.J. Ruijgh, *Autour de τε épique. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam 1971, 839). To my mind, Slater's observation that τύ in Pindar always precedes a vocative (*P*.8.61, *I*.7.31, *h.l.*), unlike cύ, which always follows it (*O*.10.3, *P*.5.6), is the description of a coincidence.

41. Αἰγίναθε δίc

The mss. read Αἰγίναι θεᾶc, which does not scan.[164] E. Schwartz' emendation Αἰγίναθε δίc ('Zu Bakchylides', *Hermes* 39, 1904, 636) is generally accepted.[165] Cf., e.g., νῦν δ' Ὀλυμπίαι cτεφανωcάμενοc | καὶ δὶc ἐκ Πυθῶνοc Ἰcθμοῖ τ', *O*.12.17/8. The presupposition that ΔΙ was misread as A and that subsequently an I was added to ΑΙΓΙΝΑ to restore the syntax[166] is entirely plausible.[167]

Αἰγίναθε δίc...| νίκαc ἐν ἀγκώνεccι πίτνων refers to two Aeginetan victories won by Euthymenes, possibly at the Delphinian Games where

[164] Unless synizesis is assumed, with Farnell (II p. 278). "Contraction of the first double short of the hemiepes in dactylo-epitrite is possible at *N*.8 strophe line 1, *fr*.221.2, B.13 strophe line 3. However, in two of the three parallels the contraction (if that is what we have) is sustained troughout the ode; this may have been the case also in the ode to which *fr*.221 belonged. This does not inspire confidence in an isolated instance of contraction in responsion with the uncontracted hemiepes, particularly since Pindar was free to use θεοῦ with the termination shortened in hiatus", Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 292.

[165] An at first sight easier correction is Αἰγίναι θεοῦ (final syllable shortened by correption), proposed by Erasmus Schmid; the reading of the mss. could be explained as originating from a marginal explanation of some one who wished to indicate that θεοῦ has to be taken with Νίκαc (thus Bury *ad loc.*, p. 94). However, there is no other example in Pindar of θεόc used as an apposition to a god or goddess mentioned by name; second, Pindar is in victory-catalogues usually precise about the number of victories; with Αἰγίναι θεοῦ we would only have the plural ποικίλων ... ὕμνων to go by, which could indicate that Euthymenes has won several times or only once (cf. *I*.2.45, *O*.6.105, *P*.4.3, *O*.10.84). More precision seems necessary, especially since these are Euthymenes' only victories, although some parallels for this may be found. This last objection must also be made against θοόc, proposed by A.W. Mair, which, moreover, gives weak sense.

[166] According to Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 292, the microfilm reveals that ms. B reads αἰγίνα θεᾶc *separatim*, with the accent indicating an oblique case.

[167] Confusion among the unical letters Α Δ Λ Μ Ν is a very common source of error, although the scarcity of this type of error in the Pindaric tradition is surprising. See Young, 'Scribal Error', p. 97.

also Pytheas has been successful (see lines 44/5 below with my note, pp. 174/5), or at the Heraea (cf. *P*.8.79). Αἰγίναθε is sometimes construed with Εὐθύμενες.[168] However, as Carey[169] rightly observes, "word order does not favour this interpretation (contrast Εὐξένιδα πάτραθε Cώγενες, *N*.7.70), which is anyway banal" (p. 295). Carey's own suggestion is that "we should detect in Αἰγίναθε the influence of the idea of motion implied in πίτνων (42): 'And you, Euthymenes, twice from Aigina casting yourself/rushing into the arms of Victory made contact with ornate songs.' Αἰγίναθε is thus a pregnant means of referring to a victory abroad" (*ibid*.).[170] He suggests that the place where Euthymenes is said to have won twice, can be deduced from the preceding passage referring to the Isthmian Games.[171] However, both these interpretations are open to the objection that it is highly unlikely that Pindar refers to victories without indicating *precisely* where they have been won. On the other hand, in the case of victories won by other members of the victor's family, the home-town of these kinsmen need not be mentioned, since it is the same as the victor's (cf. e.g. Themistius, lines 50-4). Moreover, 'separative' or 'ablative' expressions referring to the place where the victory has been won—whence, so to speak, the prize has been carried away—, are not uncommon. Cf. ἔχοντα Πυθωνόθεν | τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν | μέλος χαρίεν, *P*.5.105-7; εἴη νιν εὐφώνων πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλάαις | Πιερίδων, ἔτι καὶ Πυθῶθεν 'Ολυμπιάδων τ' ἐξαιρέτοις | 'Αλφεοῦ ἔρνεσι φράξαι χεῖρα τιμὰν ἑπταπύλοις | Θήβαισι τεύχοντ', *I*.1.64-7; ἐπεὶ στεφάνους | ἓξ ὤπασεν Κάδμου στρατῶι ἐξ ἀέθλων, *I*.1.10-1; *O*.12.17-8 (quoted above).

42. Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων

'Falling in the (bent) arms of Victory.' Cf. ἀδυπνόωι τέ νιν ἀσπάζοντο φωνᾶι | χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας | γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν, τὰν δὴ

---

[168] 'Euthymenes from Aegina'; thus J.E. Sandys, *Pindar* (London, 1919), p. 363; E. Wüst, *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter* (Diss. Tübingen, 1967), p. 167.

[169] C. Carey, 'Two Transitions in Pindar, *O*.8.52-5, *N*.5.37-42', *CQ* 39 (1989), 287-295.

[170] Thus also T. Cole, '1+1=3: Studies in Pindar's Arithmetic', *AJPh* 108 (1987), 553-568, esp. p. 564, with n. 15.

[171] T. Cole, *AJPh* 108 (1987), 564-5, does not take this passage to refer to two Isthmian victories of Euthymenes. He supposes Euthymenes' victories to be identified in lines 44-6. See also Cole's criticism of Carey in *Pindar's Feast or the Music of Power* (Rome, 1992), p. 139. The scholia on line 37 (Εὐθυμένης ὃς ἐνίκησεν Ἴσθμια, 67a, III 96 Dr.) and 38 (εἶτα ἐποίσει διὰ τί τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐμνήσθη, 70b, III 96 Dr.) refer to an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes. These remarks can be understood perfectly well without any reference in this ode to an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes. From *I*.6 it can be deduced that Euthymenes has won twice on the Isthmus (and at least once in Nemea). So the remark of the scholiast on line 37 is in fact true, although Euthymenes' Isthmian victories must be posterior to this ode. See preceding note.

καλέοιςιν Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς | ἄλςος, *I*.2.25-8. Silk, *Interaction*, p. 154, suggests that the phrase Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεςςι πίτνων has erotic connotations. He points out that the epic expression ἐν ἀγκοίνῃςι is often used in erotic contexts[172] and that, although "ἐν ἀγκώνεςςι πίτνων can hardly be claimed to suggest the victor actually making love to Nike, it is prepared as such by the strong erotic tendency of the ode hitherto (Peleus and Thetis), especially the account of Hyppolyte's designs on Peleus (26-33)." This would support Bury's suggestion (p. 94) that there is a parallel between Euthymenes (and Pytheas) and Peleus, who both won a goddess. The erotic connotations of phrase here are then meant to lead the audience to connecting the two events. See interpretation, pp. 79, 85/6.

πίτνων is a pun. The verb is a technical wrestling term denoting the fall.[173] Normally a fall means defeat.[174] The same imagery underlies μήτ' ἐν ὀρφανίαι πέςωμεν ςτεφάνων, *I*.8.6 (also for a pancratiast) and *I*.2.25-8 (quoted above).

Elsewhere the image is from the fall of dice. Cf. esp. πολλὰ δ' ἀνθρώποις παρὰ γνώμαν ἔπεςεν, *O*.12.10. In other passages, however, no specific image seems to be implied: ἐν δ' ἀφύκτοιςι γυιοπέδαις πεςών, *P*.2.41; τελεύταθεν δὲ λόγων κορυφαὶ | ἐν ἀλαθείαι πετοῖςαι, *O*.7.68/9; ἔπεςε δ' οὐ Χαρίτων ἑκάς, *P*.8.21, *sc.* Aegina (cf. my note, pp. 503/4).

On vases victory is often depicted by means of Nike spreading out her arms to an athlete, e.g., on an Attic red-figured scyphos from the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, inv. nr. 288 (1890.35), by the Penelope-painter, from ca. 440, found in Chiusi (J.D. Beazley, *CVA Great Britain 3, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1*, Oxford 1927, III I, fig. XLVI, 8-9 + p. 38), and an Attic red-figured colonette-crater from the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden, inv. nr. I 1952-1.1, by the so-called 'Orestes-painter', from ca. 435 (M.F. Vos, *CVA The Netherlands 5, Leiden 3*, Leiden 1983, 42, fig. 146).

42. ποικίλων ἔψαυςας ὕμνων

Euthymenes 'touched variegated hymns,' i.e., victory odes (either composed by professionals like Pindar or impromptu victory revels

---

[172] Cf. Ἀλκμήνην ..., | ἥ ῥ' Ἡρακλῆα θραςυμέμνονα θυμολέοντα | γείνατ' ἐν ἀγκοίνῃςι Διὸς μεγάλοιο μιγεῖςα, *Od*.11.266-8 (cf. *ibid.* line 261); Ζηνὸς γὰρ τοῦ ἀρίςτου ἐν ἀγκοίνῃςιν ἰαύεις, *Il*.14.213; Θηρὼ δ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν ἀγκοίνῃςι πεςοῦςα | γείνατο, Hes.*fr*.252.5/6 M.-W. For the phrase cf. further: Hes.*fr*.43a.81, *h.Cer*.141, 264, Matro.*Conv*.39, Hp.*Prorrh*.2.15, Archestr.9.3/4. For ἀγκών, 'bent arm', cf. *O*.2.83,-*Il*.5.802, *Od*.14.485, etc.

[173] M.B. Poliakoff, *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*, Meisenheim 1982, 12 n. 5.

[174] Bury's translation ("But at Aegina, Euthymenes, where thy fall was in the arms of the goddess Victory, thou wert caressed by artful hymns", p. 94) nicely activates this association in English, although in his commentary Bury follows another interpretation, associating πίτνω with πότμος.

like τήνελλα καλλίνικε) were sung for his two Aeginetan victories. **ψαύω**, 'touch', is in Pindar used literally only in εἶπε δ' ἐν μέσσοις ἀπάγεσθαι, ὃς ἂν πρῶτος θορὼν | ἀμφί οἱ ψαύσειε πέπλοις, *P.*9.119/20 (cf. further *Il.*13.132, 16.216, 23.519, 806, Hdt.2.47, 3.30, etc.). It has been observed before[175] that Pindar often uses verbs meaning 'touching', like (ἐπι)ψαύω, (ἐφ)ἅπτομαι, and θιγγάνω, or 'mingling,' like (συμ)μείγνυμι and κεράννυμι, and also ὁμιλέω, freely, in a metaphorical sense, in order to relate two notions to one another. See further introduction, pp. 30/1. For **ποικίλος** see my note on line 28 above (pp. 147/8). For the ideal of poetical ποικιλία see introduction, pp. 22/3.

Antistrophe Γ

43. ἦτοι μεταΐξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα

Text and meaning are uncertain. In the appendix (pp. 605-11) I argue that the text as printed here must be correct; that the meaning is 'having rushed after you, Pytheas, now also your uncle does honour to that hero's (i.e., Peleus') kindred race (i.e., the Aeginetans),' which implies that (at least) one of Euthymenes' two Aeginetan victories mentioned in the preceding lines was posterior to Pytheas' Nemean victory. This exceptional circumstance may account for the special place Pindar gives to Euthymenes in this ode.

44-46.

Some scholars have suggested that lines 44-6 refer to one Nemean victory and an indefinite number of victories in Aegina and Megara won by Euthymenes. As has been noted by Carey (*CQ* 39, 1989, 291), the third person ἐκράτει is problematic, if a vocative (Πυθέα) is read in line 43 (see appendix, pp. 605-11). Carey's conclusion is that the third person does not refer to the same individual as the one addressed in the second person, and that Euthymenes (referred to in the third person in line 43) is the subject of ἐκράτει. If this were true, the line would refer to an Aeginetan victory won by Euthymenes, which would make it a peculiarly vague reformulation of lines 41-2. This problem is solved by Carey by taking lines 41-2 to refer to two Isthmian victories instead of two won at a local festival in Aegina. This, however, is extremely unlikely, as I have argued above. So, if lines 41-2 refer to two Aeginetan victories of Euthymenes, the only

[175] See, e.g., Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, 94-6; Bowra, *Pindar*, 226/7; Gerber on *O.*1.86.

possibility is that Pytheas is the subject of ἐκράτει. An additional argument for this is the fact that Pytheas' opponents are described as ἅλικας, as boys of the same age. Pancratiasts, like wrestlers and boxers, competed in their own age categories. As a rule Pindar does not refer to this principle in the case of a victory in the men's category, as in Euthymenes' case, but he always does if the victor was successful in the category of boys or adolescents, as Pytheas (line 6). Moreover, as Carey himself remarks, "we must of course always bear in mind that Pindar's original audience knew all the facts and would probably not be as confused by the syntactical gymnastics described above as the modern reader would be" (*ibid.*). To my mind, the third person reference to Pytheas is understandable.[176] If Pytheas is the subject of ἐκράτει in line 45, lines 45-6 refer to an unspecified number of Aeginetan and Megarean victories won by him. For line 44 see next note.

44. ἁ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, ὃν φίλης' Ἀπόλλων
'Nemea is firmly fixed, and so is the local month which Apollo loves.' Of the verb only the perfect tense (and the substantivated form ἄρμενα, in the sense 'what is appropriate', *O.*8.73, *N.*3.58) is attested in Pindar. Literally it means 'to be fixed.' Pindar uses it however exclusively in a metaphorical way. καὶ τόθι κλειναῖς Ἐρεχθειδᾶν χαρίτεσσιν ἀραρὼς | ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις, *I.*2.19/20 (*sc.* Xenocrates), clearly means that the victor 'is fixed to', fitted with an Athenian victory. Similarly, καὶ πυρπάλαμον βέλος | ὀρσικτύπου Διὸς | ἐν ἅπαντι κρατεῖ ἀραρότα, *O.*10.80-3, must mean that the thunderbolt is 'fixed to' Zeus' total power, i.e., that his power is connected to, based on his thunder-bolt.[177] These two passages have in common that the verb has a complement: it is used to associate the subject closely and firmly with the notion referred to by the comple-

---

[176] All the same, Kayser's easy conjecture ἐκράτεις deserves consideration. This presupposes a corruption from a second person to a third person, which might be accounted for by the second person reference to Pytheas in line 43 already having been corrupted into a third person (the nominative Πυθέας instead of the vocative Πυθέα) in most of the texts the scholiasts had at their disposal.

[177] Thus Friese, Boeckh ('summae potentiae Iovis aptatum'), Mezger ('dem Allgewalt innewohnt'), Dornseiff, *olympische Hymnen*, Puech, Werner, Wüst, Verdenius. Κρατεῖ does not have the connotation 'victory' here (as supposed by Gildersleeve *ad loc.* "in every victory fit emblem"; F.G. Schneidewin *ad loc.* "nexum, iunctum, omni victoriæ, h.e. inseparabile a victoriis, quum nulla victoria esse possit, nisi annuente Iove potenti fulmine suo"; Bowra [transl. 1969] "fitting in every victory", p. 109; Fennel, LSJ B 2, Lehnus), for the context does not activate this connotation. Viljoen's suggestion ("so is oppermagtige Zeus se bliksem, in sy vurige hand, vasgeplant in 'n basis wat geheel uit krag bestaan", p. 97) is not very convincing.

ments, without making the precise logical relation explicit. Thus the usage of ἀραρώς is comparable to the familiar Pindaric metaphors of touching and mixing (see introduction, pp. 30/1). In τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν, *N.*3.64, no grammatical complement to ἄραρε can be found. But, on the other hand, we have the possibility of interpreting αὐτόθεν as representing such an indirect object: the 'far shining light of the Aeacids is firmly fixed from Aegina.' The verb may evoke associations of the the fame being stable, not easily broken down. See further my note (pp. 369-72).

Here we have two possibilies. Since no complement of ἄραρεν is expressed, one may think of Pytheas, mentioned in the preceding line, as the complement of ἄραρεν, interpreting the line as 'the Nemean and Delphinian Games are firmly fixed to him,' i.e., he has won at both (cf. *I.*2.19). A disadvantage of this interpretation is that line 45 contains the same factual information as the second half of line 44. It is preferable to take lines 44-6 to mean 'Nemea and the month of this land, loved by Apollo (i.e., the Delphinian Games), are firmly fixed; that is where he has won.' As in *N.*3.64, the verb has connotations of solid stability, underscoring the fame and importance of the two festivals. Praising the importance of the games where a victor has won is not uncommon at all (cf., e.g., the opening lines of *O.*1, lines 93-5 of the same ode, etc.). The fact that Pytheas has won in Nemea need not be expressed here, for it has already been expressed in lines 4-5, and his victory on Aegina is mentioned unambiguously in line 45. Moreover, the coordination of both phrases by means of μέν...δέ strongly supports this interpretation.

•*The Delphinian Games:* The reference of the 'local month dear to Apollo' is to the Delphinian Games in Aegina (cf. οἴκοι, 45), named after the month Delphinios in which they were held, in honour of Apollo Delphinios.

Cf. ἄγεται δ' ἐν Αἰγίνῃ Δελφίνια Ἀπόλλωνι, Σ.*ad P.*8.66 [II 91 Dr.]; παρ' Αἰγινήταις Δελφίνιος μὴν ἄγεται Δελφινίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερός....καὶ εἴη ἂν ὁ μὴν οὗτος, ἐν ᾧι θύουσιν Αἰγινῆται Ἀπόλλωνι οἰκιστῆι καὶ δωματίστηι, καθά φησι Πυθαίνετος[178], Σ.*ad N.*5.44 [81a Dr.]). The Delphinian Games were famous for a match that is called 'Hydrophoria' by the Σ.*ad* line 44 (81b Dr.) and that is otherwise known as the Ἀμφορίτης ἀγών. This was a race in which the contestants had to run from the harbour to the well Asopis and from there back again with filled amphoras. The 'historical' example for this race was given by the Argonauts by their landing on Aegina. Cf. A.R.4.1765-72, Apollod.1.9.26, Callimachus, cited by Σ.*ad O.*7.86 [156b Dr.], *fr.*198 Pf., *Dieg.*8.21. See further Reisch, *RE* I, 1976,

[178] *FHG* iv 487.

s.v. 'Ἀμφορίτης ἀγών; Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, 172/3; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, II, p. 466 and IV, p. 147; Privitera, *QUCC* 29, 1988, 68/9; see also my note on *N.*3.3-4 ὕδατι ἐπ' Ἀσωπίωι. It is perhaps not entirely irrelevant that Apollo Delphinios was the protector of seamen, ships, and harbours (cf. *hAp.*19-24). See also A. Stéfos, *Apollon chez Pindare*, Athens 1975, 202/3.

For **ἐπιχώριος** cf. Ἥρας τ' ἀγῶν' ἐπιχώριον, *P.*8.79, of the Aeginetan Heraea (see my note, p. 578); ὅσαι τ' εἰσὶν ἐπιχωρίων καλῶν ἔσοδοι | τετόλμακε, *P.*5.116/7 (for Arcesilaus of Cyrene); ἔν τε καὶ πᾶσιν | ἐπιχωρίοις, *P.*9.102/3 (for Telesicrates of Cyrene). The aorist **φίλης'** has to be interpreted as a so-called 'gnomicus': "the fact that a thing repeatedly, or always, or never was so in the past, may be taken to imply that it repeatedly, or always, or never, *is* so in general; this implication may suggest itself to the hearer, and thus lead to the intended interpretation of the statement, independently of any explicit signs like πολλάκις and οὔπω," Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 36.

45. ἅλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἴκοι τ' ἐκράτει

'At home he conquered all of his own age who came.' This is a poetic but unambiguous way of saying that Pytheas (not Euthymenes, see above) had won an unspecified number of victories in local Aeginetan games (*viz.* the Delphinian Games, circumscribed in the preceding line) in his own age category (*viz.* in the category of boys or of adolescents; cf. line 6 above). See my general note above.

οἴκοι is used from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience (cf. introduction, p. 8, n. 18): 'at home,' i.e., in Aegina. Cf. *P.*8.65. In *N.*2.23, in an ode written for Timodemus from Acharnae in Attica, it is used to refer to the Panathenean Games. For **κρατέω** used for being victorious, cf. *O.*8.20, 10.100, *P.*2.5, 10.23, *N.*3.52, 6.35, 10.25, *I.*3.13, B.6.7, 15. For **ἅλιξ** cf. ἄλλοισι δ' ἅλικες ἄλλοι, *N.*4.91; ὑμεναίων, ἅλικες | οἷα παρθένοι φιλέοισιν ἑταῖραι | ἑσπερίαις ὑποκουρίζεσθ' ἀοιδαῖς, *P.*3.17-9; ἕκατι στεφάνων θαητὸν ἐν ἅλιξι θησέμεν ἐν καὶ παλαιτέροις, *P.*10.58, etc. See also my 'Athletic Age Categories in Victory Odes' (forthcoming).

46. Νίσου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφωι

A circumscription of 'in Megara,' cf. Νίσου τ' ἐν λόφωι, *P.*9.91; Νίσου πόλις, E.*HF* 954. For the Megarian games see my note on *N.*3.84 (pp. 420/1).

Nisos was a legendary king of Megara (cf. Σ.*ad h.l.*, 84b III 98 Dr.), probably honoured in Megara as a heros (cf. τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν πυλῶν τῶν παρὰ τοῦ Νίσου ἐπὶ τὸ Ποσειδώνιον, Th.4.118.4, from which we may conclude that there was a monument or a grave named after Nisos). In Hyg.*Fab.*198.242 he is called *Martis filius*. Elsewhere he is known as one of the four sons of Pandion, king of Attica. Nisos obtained the Megaris when his father devided his territory among his sons (Strab.9.392, S.*fr.*872, Σ.*ad* Ar.*Vesp.*1223, Σ.*ad* E.*Hipp.*35, Callim.*fr.*47, Apollod.3.20.6).

εὐαγκής occurs only here and in Πίνδον ἀν' εὐάγκειαν, Call.*Cer.*82. In *Il.*4.453 we find the *hapax* μισγάγκεια (ὡς δ' ὅτε χείμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ῥέοντες | ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ, κτλ); cf. also ἔν τε συναγκείαισι παρίσταcο δεξιτερῆφι, *AP* 6.188.5 (Leon.). These adjectives and nouns are derived from ἄγκος, 'bend, hollow, mountain-glen' (cf. *Il.*20.490, *Od.*4.337, Hes.*Op.*389, Hdt.6.74, E.*Ba.*1051, Theoc.8.33, etc.).

λόφος means 'crest.' Homer uses it for the back of a horse's neck (πολὺς δ' ἀνεκήκιεν ἱδρὼς | ἵππων ἔκ τε λόφων καὶ ἀπὸ στέρνοιο χαμᾶζε, *Il.*23.507/8; cf. 10.573 and also S.*Ant.*293, Dsc.4.185), and mainly for the crest of a helmet (*Il.*6.469, 15.537, 16.138, 18.612, 19.383, etc.; cf. also Alc.15.2, 22, A.*Th.*384, Ar.*Ach.*575, 586, 965/6, 1074, Hdt.1.171, X.*Cyr.*6.4.2, Theoc.22.186, etc.). Homer occasionally uses this noun figuratively for the crest, the top of a hill: λᾶαν ἄνω ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον, *Od.*11.596, of Sisyphus; ὑπὲρ πόλιος, ὅθι Ἕρμαιος λόφος ἐστίν, *Od.*16.470. Pindar uses λόφος exclusively in this metaphorical sense: Ζεῦ, Κρόνιόν τε ναίων λόφον, *O.*5.17, i.e. the so-called Hill of Kronos in Olympia, north of the sanctuary (cf. πάγον | Κρόνου, *O.*10.49/50); Κρισαῖον λόφον | ἄμειψεν ἐν κοιλόπεδον νάπος | θεοῦ, *P.*5.38/9. Cf. also Hdt.2.124, Th.4.124, Pl.*Lg.*682b.

46-49

I am glad that the whole city fights for noble ends. Know this: (surprisingly) sweet was the recompense for your labours that you got as your share because you had Menander. It is necessary that an architect of athletes comes from Athens.

46-47. χαίρω δ' ὅτι | ἐσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις

The verb μάρναμαι means 'to fight'. It is used literally for fighting a war.[179] It may also be used metaphorically in the sense of 'contending' at the games,[180] or with reference to a less specific situation, in the sense of 'fighting for something, striving, exerting oneself.'[181] Here μάρναται is generally taken in a metaphorical sense, 'I rejoice that the whole city[182] joins in the conflict for noble prizes.'[183] Apart from the fact that this is a bold exaggeration, an objection against this interpre-

[179] Cf. *O.*6.17, *P.*2.65, *P.*8.43.
[180] Cf. *I.*4.31; *I.*5.54.
[181] Cf. *O.*5.15, *N.*1.25, *N.*10.86.
[182] In Pindar πᾶσα πόλις can mean 'the whole city' as well as 'every city' (cf. ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἐν Πίσαι ἔλσαις ὅλον τε στρατὸν | λάιαν τε πᾶσαν, *O.*10.43/4; ὁ δέ οἱ φράζε καὶ παντὶ στρατῶι', *N.*1.61; παντὶ θυμῶι, *h.l.* line 31; and: ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι ... | στεῖχ', *h.l.* 2/3; ἀνάπαυσις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργωι, *N.*7.52; ἄγγελον ἐσλὸν ἔφα τιμὰν μεγίσταν πράγματι παντὶ φέρειν, *P.*4.278, respectively). The Σ.*ad loc.* takes it in the former way, paraphrasing πᾶσα ἡ πόλις.
[183] Bury *ad loc.*, p. 96.

tation is that the idea of a city contending at the games is unparalleled in Pindar. The contestants are invariably presented as individuals (who, of course, do honour to their cities when they are successful) and Pindar nowhere says that a city as a whole takes part in the games.

The fact that πᾶςα πόλις is the subject of μάρναται is strongly in favour of a literal interpretation of the verb. A literal interpretation is to be preferred on theoretical grounds as well. In general, a word is used metaphorically only if the denotation of that word does not make sense in the context, its use being motivated by the relevance of its connotations. According to the 'cooperative principle' described by H.P. Grice,[184] the hearer will test the possibility whether a word might be used metaphorically only if the literal interpretation of the word proves to be irrelevant in the context. A literal interpretation here results in 'I am glad that the whole city is fighting for things worth fighting for.'[185] If this ode was in fact performed during[186] a war between Aegina and Athens, as I have argued in *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32, this is to be understood as referring to Aegina fighting a war and as a declaration of Pindar's solidarity and sympathy with Aegina, in concord defending its own cause against its big enemy. See further the interpretation, pp. 66-88.

For **περί** c. dat., denoting that the notion it qualifies is, so to speak, at stake, cf. ὅςτις ἁμιλλᾶται περὶ | ἐςχάτων ἀέθλων κορυφαῖς, *N.*10.31/2; περὶ δ' ὑψικόμωι [Ἑ]λέναι χρῆν ἄρα Πέργαμον εὐρὺ[ν] ἀιςτῶςαι ςέλας αἰθομένου πυρός, *Pae.*6.95-8; περὶ χρήμαςι μοχθίζει βιαίως, *fr.*123.7.

48. τοι

The particle τοι here signals the poet's awareness of the fact that his statement—that it was by means of collaborating with an *Athenian* trainer that Pytheas had been successful—had an element of surprise to it for the Aeginetan audience. Explicitly signalling this awareness is a means for the poet to sympathize with the audience's anti-Athenian sentiments, which, if our hypothesis is accepted, will have been even more fierce than usual in the current period of the all-out war between the two states. See further Interpretation (pp. 66-88; cf. my *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32). For a more detailed analysis of the pragmatic value of the particle τοι in general, see appendix, pp. 611-3.

---

[184] H.P. Grice, 'Logic and Conversation', in: P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (edd.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (New York, 1975), pp. 41-58. See also my 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89 (1994), 305-317, esp. pp. 306-7.

[185] ἐςλός has aristocratic connotations. Cf. *N.*3.29 and *P.*8.73 with my notes (pp. 568, 634/5, 638).

[186] That this ode, *pace* Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 170), was performed *during* the war can be deduced from the present tense μάρναται in line 47.

48. Μενάνδρου cὺν τύχαι

'With the help of Menander.' Not 'through Menander's fortune'[187]: cf., e.g., ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, | ὅ τι κε cὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι | γλῶcca φρενὸc ἐξέλοι βαθείαc, *N.*4.6-8; τύχαι θεῶν | ἀφίξεται λαῶι cὺν ἀβλαβεῖ | Ἄβαντοc εὐρυχόρουc ἀγυιάc, *P.*8.53-5; cὺν θεοῦ δὲ τύχαι | ἕτερον οὔ τινα οἶκον ἀπεφάνατο πυγμαχία ⟨πλεόνων⟩ | ταμίαν cτεφάνων μυχῶι Ἑλλάδοc ἁπάcαc, *N.*6.24-6; ὃc τύχαι μὲν δαίμονοc, ἀνορέαc δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακὼν | ἐν τέτραcιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοιc | νόcτον ἔχθιcτον, *O.*8.67-9; Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰδῶ δίδοι καὶ τύχαν τερπνῶν γλυκεῖαν, *O.*13.105, etc. Μενάνδρου cὺν τύχαι is, so to speak, equivalent to Μενάνδρου τυχών. Menander was Pytheas' trainer, as τέκτον' ἀεθληθαῖcιν in the following line makes clear.

Thus perhaps also τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ cὺν τύχαι πότμου cοφίαc ἄριcτον, *P.*2.56, a phrase with a "chequered career" (Carey, *ad loc.*, p. 43). In spite of the many difficulties, it seems certain that cὺν τύχαι πότμου is to be taken together. The best interpretation is perhaps 'to be rich by fortune's grace (i.e. wealth combined with good fortne) is wisdom's highest part' (thus Carey, p. 44). See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 111-4 (§ 110). Cf. also her remark "la solidarité des éléments cὺν τύχαι πότμου, traduits par 'avec l'aide du destin,' suppose une quasi-grammaticalisation de l'expression τύχαι ou cὺν τύχαι πότμου = cὺν πότμωι, cὺν τύχαι = cὺν, voire τύχαι = cύν" (p. 111).

48-49. γλυκεῖαν...μόχθων ἀμοιβὰν | ἐπαύρεο

'You got sweet recompense for your toils (as your share).' Pytheas' victory was his reward for the hardships of training and competition. For the 'πόνοc-motif' see my note on *N.*3.17/8 (pp. 276-8).

For the phrase cf. τῶν...μόχθων ἀμπνοάν, *O.*8.7; ἄποινα μόχθων, *N.*7.16; Οὐλία παῖc ἔνθα νικάcαιc δὶc ἔcχεν Θεαῖοc εὐφόρων λάθαν πόνων, *N.*10.24; λύτρον εὔδοξον...καμάτων, *I.*8.1, etc. For **ἀμοιβά**, 'something given in return,' cf. τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖc ἀμοιβαῖc ἐποιχομένουc τίνεcθαι, *P.*2.24. Cf. also *O.*1.39, *P.*7.14/5, *I.*1.53. For **ἐπαυρέω**, 'get as one's share,' cf. δαίμων δ' ἕτεροc | ἐc κακὸν τρέψαιc ἐδαμάccατό νιν, καὶ γειτόνων | πολλοὶ ἐπαῦρον, *P.*3.34-6, 'many of the neighbours got the same share'[188]; *Il.*18.302. The complement usually is a genitive, cf. *Il.*13.733, E.*IT* 529, *TragAdesp.*95.4 (= *ComAdesp.*1207.4), etc. For the accusative, cf. *Il.*13.649, *Od.*18.107, *AP* 9.332 (Noss.). The verb is sometimes construed with both a genitive and an accusative, e.g., in A.*Pr.*28.

---

[187] Thus Bowra (*Odes of Pindar*, p. 40), Slater *s.v.* τύχα. It is not clear exactly how the trainer's good luck could influence the result of the tournament.

[188] Not 'many have had enjoyment of (i.e. suffered loss from) neighbours', LSJ *s.v.*, I 1.

Epode Γ

49. χρὴ δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀεθληταῖϲιν ἔμμεν

The sentence devoted to crediting Pytheas' Athenian trainer Menander gives the impression that Menander is only mentioned by virtue of epinician conventions, notwithstanding a general Aeginetan antipathy against his Athenian origin: it almost sounds as an apology. μηκέτι ῥίγει in line 50 below justifies this assumption. See further interpretation, pp. 81-4.

Of course the semi-apologetical statement only works if the claim that it is inevitable that a trainer comes from Athens was acceptable to the audience; although we may allow Pindar a slight degree of exaggeration, the claim must have been basically true.[189] Apparently Athenian trainers had a very good reputation at the time, being especially successful and famous, so that it was a *communis opinio* among the connoisseurs that good trainers come from Athens.[190] We lack the evidence to justify this assumption, but the famous Athenian trainer Melesias would be an example.

For the metaphor **τέκτων** for the trainer it is illustrative to compare a passage from Philostratus, comparing a trainer to a sculptor: ἤθη δὲ αὖ τῶν ϲώματοϲ ⟨μερῶν⟩[191] ὥϲπερ ἐν ἀγαλματοποιίαι ὧδε ἐπιϲκεπτέον· ϲφυρὸν μὲν καρπῶι ὁμολογεῖν, κνήμηι δὲ πῆχυν καὶ βραχίονα μηρῶι ἀντικρίνεϲθαι καὶ ὤμωι γλουτόν, μετάφρενα δὲ θεωρεῖϲθαι πρὸϲ γαϲτέρα καὶ ϲτέρνα ἐκκεῖϲθαι παραπληϲίωϲ τοῖϲ ὑπὸ τὸ ἰϲχίον, κεφαλήν τε ϲχῆμα τοῦ παντὸϲ οὖϲαν πρὸϲ ταῦτα πάντα ἔχειν ξυμμέτρωϲ, *Gym.*25. Pindar often uses τέκτων in a metaphorical way: τέκτονα νωδυνίαϲ ἥμερον γυιαρκέοϲ Ἀϲκλαπιόν, *P.*3.6; μελιγαρύων τέκτονεϲ | κώμων νεανίαι, *N.*3.4/5 (with my note, pp. 248/9); ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν τέκτονεϲ οἷα ϲοφοὶ | ἅρμοϲαν, *P.*3.113/4.

---

[189] The scholiasts (89a/b, III 98/9 Dr.) explain this statement by referring to the myth that Theseus invented the pancration. Σ.89a: τοῦτο δέ φηϲιν, ἐπειδὴ πρότερον ὁ Θηϲεὺϲ Ἀθηναῖοϲ ὢν εὗρε παγκράτιον ἄνευ μυρμήκων· ἡνίκα γὰρ ἐν τῶι Λαβυρίνθωι ἐξηϲθένει πρὸϲ τὴν ἰϲχὺν τοῦ Μινωταύρου, παγκρατίωι αὐτὸν διαπαλαίων περιγέγονεν· οὐ γὰρ εἶχε μάχαιραν· καὶ οὕτωϲ ἐνομίϲθη εὑρέτηϲ τῆϲ πυγμῆϲ. ἴϲωϲ οὖν ὁ Πίνδαροϲ οὐκ ἀγρῶϲ μέμνηται τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτόν τι ὑποϲημαίνων. 89b: ἐν Ἀθήναιϲ φαϲὶν εὑρῆϲθαι τὴν παλαιϲτρικὴν ὑπὸ Φόρβαντοϲ τοῦ παιδοτρίβου Θηϲέωϲ· τινὲϲ δὲ τοὐναντίον Θηϲέα μὲν παρ' Ἀθηνᾶϲ τὴν πάλην μαθεῖν, Φόρβαντα δὲ ὑπὸ Θηϲέωϲ. Φερεκύδηϲ (*FHG* I 97 M, I 98 J) δὲ ἡνίοχον τὸν Φόρβαντά φηϲι Θηϲέωϲ, ϲὺν ὧι καὶ τὴν Ἀμαζόνα ἁρπάζει. καὶ Πολέμων δὲ ἱϲτορεῖ (*FHG* III 132) πάλην εὑρηκέναι Φόρβαντα Ἀθηναῖον. ὅτι δὲ Θηϲεὺϲ παρ' Ἀθηνᾶϲ ἔμαθε τὴν πάλην, Ἴϲτροϲ ἱϲτορεῖ (*FHG* I 421). Cf. παλαιϲτικὴν γὰρ τέχνην εὗρε Θηϲεὺϲ πρῶτοϲ καὶ πάληϲ κατέϲτη ὕϲτερον ἀπ' ἐκείνου διδαϲκαλία· πρότερον ⟨δὲ⟩ ἐχρῶντο μεγέθει καὶ ῥώμηι πρὸϲ τὰϲ πάλαϲ, Paus.1.39.3; Apollod.1.9, Σ.*ad* Luc. p.65, 17 R, *Bekk. Anecd.* I 314.9.

[190] As nowadays everyone in Europe acknowledges that a good football coach must come from Holland.

[191] Suppl. Jüthner.

•*Literature:* On trainers see C.H. Basiades, *De veterum graecorum gymnastice*, Diss. Berlin 1858; J. Jüthner, *Philostratos über Gymnastik*, Leipzig & Berlin 1909, 3-30; E.N. Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London 1910, 503-5; M. Woloch, 'Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides', *CW* 56, 1963, 102-104, 121; H.A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, London 1964, 170-8.

50-55

But if you come to Themistius, in order to sing about him, shrink no longer. Give your voice. Raise your sails to the cross-piece of the mast-top and proclaim that he as a boxer and in the pancration, by his victory in Epidaurus, has taken a dubble glory, and that he brings the grassy garlands of flowers to the portal of Aeacus, together with the fair Graces.

50. εἰ δὲ Θεμίςτιον ἵκεις ὥςτ' ἀείδειν

According to the scholiast, Themistius was Pytheas' maternal grandfather,[192] so Euthymenes' father.[193] In *I*.6.65 Pytheas, Phylacidas (Pytheas' younger brother) and Euthymenes are said to be members of the οἶκος of Themistius.[194] His prominent position within the family of the victor would certainly explain why it was his privilege to dedicate the victor's crown (see lines 53/4 below, with my notes).

εἰ δέ characteristically opens a new domain, introducing a new subject matter, viz. Themistius, after Menander has been dealt with. Again, as in line 19 above, the notion 'conditional,' traditionally attached to εἰ,[195] is inadequate (see also my note on *N*.3.19, pp. 282/3). Preposed εἰ clauses make for discontinuity. Here there turns out to be a contrast between the suitability of Menander and Themistius as a subject matter for the present ode (see next note).

•*Path-of-Song Metaphor:* **ἵκεις** implies a comparison of the song with a path, an image frequently found in Pindar.

Cf. e.g. ἔγειρ' ἐπέων cφιν οἶμον λιγύν, *P*.9.47; μακρά μοι νεῖcθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα γὰρ cυνάπτει καί τινα | οἶμον ἴcαμι βραχύν, *P*.4.247/8;

---

[192] Οὗτοc δὲ λέγεται πάπποc τῶι Πυθέαι πρὸc μητρόc, Σ.91 *ad h.l.* (III p.99 Dr.).

[193] P. Maas, 'Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar', *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* 39, 1913, 316/7, regarding Euthymenes as the 'second victor' in this ode, considers it to be necessary that Euthymenes' father is mentioned in this ode; and if he is right, this can only be Themistius. See also A. Severyns, *Bacchylide, Essai biographique*, Liège 1933, 41.

[194] Themistius is not mentioned in *I*.5. Neither Euthymenes, nor Themistion are mentioned in the surviving fragments of B.13, written for the same occasion as *N*.5.

[195] Most recently by Gerry Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 3), Diss. Amsterdam 1994.

ἦρ', ὦ φίλοι, κατ' ἀμευςίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην, | ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρίν; *P.*11.38/9; καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι | ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον· ἕπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτός, *N.*6.53/4; κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνωι, *O.*8.54, etc.; see also Becker, *Bild des Weges*, 68-85. For Bacchylides cf. 5.31 (with Maehler *ad loc.*, II, pp. 96/7), 19.1/2, *fr.*27. For ἵκω/ἱκνέομαι used in this way, cf. ἵκωμαί τ' πρὸς ἀνδρῶν | καὶ γένος, *O.*6.24/5, and also ἐξείπω καὶ πάντα διΐξομαι, *Il.*9.61; ἐν μοίρηι γὰρ πάντα διΐκεο καὶ κατέλεξας, 19.186.

Becker (*Bild des Weges*, p. 70) has pointed out that the performance of a Pindaric *epinicion* lends itself only too well for comparison to following a path, because the poet must 'find his way' along a number of obligate themes. These must all be worked into the poem and interconnected in an acceptable way. The composition of a transition from one obligate theme to another can be compared to finding a path. It is therefore no surprize that we find the path-metaphor especially in transitions.[196]

Herodotus too uses the path-metaphor in transitions, cf. ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω, ἐπιστάμενος περὶ Κύρον καὶ τριφασίας ἄλλας λόγων ὁδοὺς φῆναι, Hdt.1.95; οὐ τρέπεται ἐπὶ τὴν ψευδέα ὁδόν, Hdt.1.117; cf. 2.20 (see Becker, pp. 101-138; cf. also the usage of οἴμη in epic, e.g. *Od.*8.73, 22.347; οἶμος ἀοιδῆς, *h.Merc.*451, Becker, 68-70). On the concept of οἴμη being some sort of narrative 'fil d'Ariane' see further Svenbro, *La parole et le marbre*, p. 45, n. 76. Various (contrasting) views on Pindar's road metaphors have been put forward: Bernard, *Pindars Denken in Bilder*, 13-5; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 1-60; Kurke, *Traffiic in Praise*, 15-61; Simpson, *TAPhA* 100, 1969, 437-73; further references are to be found therein.

For **ὥστε** with the infinitive cf. lines 1, 36 above with my notes, pp. 100, 161.

50. μηκέτι ῥίγει

After briefly dealing with the victor's Athenian trainer Menander in 48-9, Pindar turns to Themistius: 'But if you come to sing of Themistius, shrink no longer. Give your voice' (50-1). By means of μηκέτι ῥίγει Pindar explicitly characterizes his treatment of the Athenian trainer Menander in 48-9, in retrospect, as cold; there he did 'shrink back.'[197] That Pindar did perform the action of ῥιγεῖν be-

---

[196] Becker, p. 71: "Der Übergang von einem Programmpunkt zum andern ist der Ort, wo das Bild vom Wege des Liedes besonders reich ausgestaltet wird."

[197] Thus also Wilamowitz, p. 170. Bury (p. 97) too interprets μηκέτι ῥίγει correctly ('"Be reserved no longer" implies that there were reasons for reserve in reference to somebody else.'), but he does not draw the obvious conclusion that this applies to the preceding section of the poem, where Menander is mentioned.

fore is implied by ἔτι and by the use of the *present* imperative.[198] See further interpretation, pp. 81-4, 86.

It has often been argued that ἔτι in most cases is merely a rhetorical reinforcement of μή,[199] in other words, that ἔτι does not necessarily imply that the action negated by μηκέτι actually was performed before. This idea may have originated in a number of instances where the verb negated by μηκέτι is accompanied by a comparative (μηκέθ' ἁλίου cκόπει | ἄλλο θαλπνότερον...ἄcτρον, *O.*1.5-6; μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρcιον, *O.*1.114; μηκέτι μακροτέραν cπεύδειν ἀρετάν, *I.*4.13). In these cases ἔτι is called 'superfluous,' because the denotation of ἔτι, 'further, longer,' is also expressed by the comparative.[200] However, renderings like 'do not look further for another star, warmer than the sun,' 'do not strive for more any longer,' 'do not strive any longer for a result greater than this' demonstrate the dubious character of the notion 'superfluous' even in these cases. And even if a certain amount of redundancy is conceded to the passages with a comparative, one should not use these passages as an argument to eliminate the denotation of ἔτι in instances without a comparative, like this (cf. also ἀρχοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἔcαν Ταλαοῦ παῖδες, βιαcθέντες λύαι · | κρέccων δὲ καππαύει δίκαν τὰν πρόcθεν ἀνήρ, *N.*9.14-5).[201]

---

[198] See, e.g., C.M.J. Sicking, 'The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms, Especially in the Imperative', *Glotta* 69 (1991), 14-43 and 154-170, esp. p. 157 with his examples 78-80, pp. 160-1.

[199] Cf. e.g. Dissen, Gerber, Verdenius, *ad O.*1.5; Verdenius, 'Tyrtaeus 6-7D. A Commentary', *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), 345, speaks of 'rhetorical μηκέτι'.

[200] See, e.g., O. Becker, *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (*Hermes Einzelschriften*, Heft 4; Berlin, 1937), p. 71 n. 58; P. Maas, 'Zu den neuen Bruchstücken des Bakchylides', *Jahresberichte Philol. Verein Berlin* 45 (1919), 39 n. 8 (= *Kleine Schriften* [München, 1973], 30-1 n. 8), who regards ἔτι here as 'abundierend', referring to *O.*1.5, and denies that earlier, in 48-9 where Menander is mentioned, Pindar 'shuddered' ('Dann ist μηκέτι ῥίγει einfache Litotes'). W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikions* (Halle, 1928), p. 25 n. 2 (= *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse* 5.2, 259-343, at p. 283 n. 2), disapproves of Maas's 'abundierend', but does not draw the conclusion that Pindar implicitly characterizes his act of praising Menander as an act of ῥιγεῖν: 'Vielmehr: "gilt's den Themistios zu preisen, dann heraus mit der Stimme, so daß sie (im Vergleich zu solchem Jubel) vorher klamm gewesen zu sein scheint". Es gilt also nicht, Früheres abzuschwächen ..., sondern das Neue hervorzuheben. Lebendige und prachtvoll "unlogische" Steigerung des Motivs *O.*9.109.' But if Pindar wanted to give emphasis to his praise of Themistius without detracting anything from the praise of Menander, this would have been a rather tactless means of doing so.

[201] For ἔλπετο δ' οὐκέτι οἱ κεῖνόν γε πράξαcθαι πόνον, *P.*4.243 (Jason had mastered the fire-breathing bulls, but when it came to the serpent that guarded the fleece, Aietes did not expect him to accomplish that), B.K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin & New York, 1988), p. 332, suggeted: 'not "no longer" ... but "not now". The reference is not to the continuation of an action already begun, but to the execution of it at a particular time.' The point is, however,

ῥιγέω (mainly epic, only *h.l.* in Pindar) means 'to shudder' with cold[202] or especially with fear or horror: 'to shrink back.' Cf. τὸν (*sc.* Hector) δὲ ἰδὼν ῥίγηcε βοὴν ἀγαθὸc Διομήδηc. | ὡc δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἀπάλαμνοc, ἰὼν πολέοc πεδίοιο, | cτήηι ἐπ' ὠκυρόωι ποταμῶι ἅλαδε προρέοντι, | ἀφρῶι μορμύροντα ἰδών, ἀνά τ' ἔδραμ' ὀπίccω, *Il.*5.596-9, cf. 11.345; ῥίγηcεν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν 'Αγαμέμνων, | ὡc εἶδεν μέλαν αἷμα καταρρέον ἐξ ὠτειλῆc· | ῥίγηcεν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸc ἀρηίφιλοc Μενέλαοc, 4.148-50; νύξε (*sc.* Κόων) δέ μιν (*sc.* 'Αγαμέμνονα) κατὰ χεῖρα μέcην ἀγκῶνοc ἔνερθεν· | ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέcχε φαεινοῦ δουρὸc ἀκωκή. | ῥίγηcεν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν 'Αγαμέμνων, | ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣc ἀπέληγε μάχηc ἠδὲ πολέμοιο, 11.252-5; cf. 4.279, 16.119.

50-51. δίδοι | φωνάν

'Give your voice,' i.e., sing without hesitation, as opposed to 'shrinking back.' For the phrase cf. νῦν μοι θράcοc καὶ γλῶτταν εὔπορον δότε | φωνήν τ' ἀναιδῆ, Ar.*Eq.*637/8; ἀπέπτυc'· 'Οcίαι γὰρ δίδωμ' ἔποc τόδε, E.*IT* 1161.

Morphologically the form δίδοι is problematic. Gregory of Corinth (*De Dial. Dor.*) explains it as a characteristic of the Doric dialect (τὸ δίδου δίδοι λέγουcι, καὶ ἄλλα, ὁμοίωc τοῖc τρίτοιc προcώποιc τῶν εὐκτικῶν τὰ δεύτερα πρόcωπα τῶν εἰc ου προcτακτικῶν ἐκφέροντεc). Modern scholars tend to take it specifically as a characteristic of the Boeotian dialect (cf. e.g. the Boeotian dedicatory inscriptions from Boeotia, from the 7th/6th century: τωc τύ, ϝάναξ, φεφύλαξο, δίδοι δ' ἀρ(ε)τάν [τε καὶ ὄλβον], Friedländer-Hoffleit, *Epigrammata*, n° 37, p. 40; Μάνταλικόc μ' ἀνέθεκε ϝεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξοι τᾶc δεκάταc· τὺ δ', Φοῖβε, δίδοι χαρίϝετταν ἀμοι[βάν, *ibid.* n° 35, p. 38; see also *ibid.* p. 41). K. Strunk, 'Der böotische Imperativ δίδοι', *Glotta* 39, 1960, 114-123, explains the form as a contamination between the athematic flexion of δίδωμι and the thematic flexion διδόω: "der Eindruck (konnte) entstehen, der Imperativ der 2. sg. werde einfach durch Auslassung des -c der 2. sg. ind. (δίδοιc) gebildet" (p. 122). Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I, p. 217, reminds us of the semantic similarity between imperativ and optativ: "Wir dürfen daraus folgern, daß der Imperativ wirklich als eine solche Ausdrucksform empfunden wurde, die eine gewisse Eindringlichkeit und Bestimmtheit hatte. Damit hängt es zusammen, daß wir außerordentlich oft vom ältesten Griechischen an anstatt des Imperativs etwa die zweite Person des Optativs, also einen Wunschausdruck, treffen.... Vielleicht stammt auch in dem Imperativ δίδοι "gib" (bei Pindar und auf alten korinthischen Inschriften) -ι aus dem Optativ." In fact, the second person plural optativ of this verb διδοῖτε is found in *P.*4.119. See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 262-4 (§ 329).

---

that ἔτι underscores the contrast with the other labour that Jason did accomplish earlier. See also M.L. West on Hes.*Op.*174 (p. 196), with further examples.

[202] Cf., e.g., κὤταν κακὸν χειμῶνα ποιήcηι θεόc, | ῥιγῶcα δίφρον ἆccον ἕλκεται πυρόc, Sem.*fr.*7.25/6 W.

51. ἀνὰ δ' ἱστία τεῖνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου

'Stretch the sails up to the cross-piece of the mast-top.' The nautical imagery circumscribes the poet's enthusiasm for his present subject. The contrast with Menander is implied (see above). For the relevance of the imagery see further interpretation, pp. 83-4. Nautical imagery in itself must have appealed to Pindar's audience, which included members of the Aeginetan aristocracy who owed their wealth and power to their seamanship (see also note on line 2 above). As in line 2 (with the ὁλκάς and the ἄκατος), the terminology of the *vehicles* is quite specific here (esp. καρχασίου), not to say technical. Poetic diction has a special affinity with depicting and specific words.[203] Moreover, by means of such nautical technicalities Pindar may imitate the argot of his Aeginetan audience.

•*The image of sails:* As a sailor has to accomodate his sails to the winds, hoisting and furling sails are ready-made images for adapting oneself to the circumstances. Cf. e.g. ἐν δὲ χρόνωι | μεταβολαὶ λήξαντος οὔρου | ἱστίων, *P.*4.291-3, suggesting to Damophilus that his bad fortune may change for the better (see also Braswell *ad loc.*, p. 391; cf. also the image of the changing winds in *O.*7.94/5, *P.*3.104/5, *I.*4.5/6). When fortune is kind to one, one can let out the sail to the wind: εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾶι παρμένων, | εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοὰν ἁδεῖαν αἰεὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις· | ἐξίει δ' ὥσπερ κυβερνάτας ἀνὴρ | ἱστίον ἀνεμόεν, *P.*1.89-92. Unfortunate circumstances force one to eat humble pie, like bad storms urge one to lower one's sails: οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν | οὖρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἱστίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν, *I.*2.39/40; νῦν δ' ἐν κακοῖς μοι πλεῖν ὑφειμένηι δοκεῖ, S.*El.*335 (with Jebb *ad loc.*, p. 52); δεῖ μ', ὡς ἔοικε, μὴ κακὸν φῦναι λέγειν, | ἀλλ' ὥστε ναὸς κεδνὸν οἰακοστρόφον | ἄκροισι λαίφους κρασπέδοις ὑπεκδραμεῖν | τὴν σὴν στόμαργον, ὦ γύναι, γλωσσαλγίαν, E.*Med.*522-5 (with Page *ad loc.*, p. 111); ἀλλ' ὅπως, ὦ γεννάδα, | μὴ πρὸς ὀργὴν ἀντιλέξεις, | ἀλλὰ συστείλας ἄκροισι | χρώμενος τοῖς ἱστίοις, | εἶτα μᾶλλον μᾶλλον ἄξεις | καὶ φυλάξεις, ἡνίκ' ἂν τὸ | πνεῦμα λεῖον καὶ καθεστηκὸς λάβηις, Ar.*Ra.*997-1003; cf. also ὑφέσθαι μοι δοκεῖ· | τὸ ληκύθιον γὰρ τοῦτο πνευσεῖται πολύ, *ibid.*1220/1[204]. He who presses his luck too far, not adapting himself to the circumstances, will be forced to lower his sails because his rig breaks: ἑκὼν δ' ἀνάγκας ἄτερ δίκαιος ὢν | οὐκ ἄνολβος ἔσται, | πανώλεθρος ⟨δ'⟩ οὔποτ' ἂν γένοιτο. | τὸν ἀντίτολμον δὲ

---

[203] In the case of Pindar this applies mainly to the nouns. For the 'colourless verbs' see introduction, pp. 31/2.

[204] Euripides frequently uses the verb συστέλλειν metaphorically without an object (*IT* 295/6, *HF.*1417), or with an object fitting into the terminology of the *tenor* (*Ba.*608/9, *Tro.*108/9; *fr.*716.3/4 N); cf. also Pl.*Lys.*210e, Isoc.8.85, Hp.*Art.*50, etc.

φαμι παρβάδαν Ι ἄγοντα πολλὰ παντόφυρτ' ἄνευ δίκας Ι βιαίως ξὺν χρόνωι καθήσειν Ι λαῖφος, ὅταν λάβηι πόνος Ι θραυομένας κεραίας, A.*Eu.*550-7; or he might even suffer shipwreck: αὔτως δὲ ναὸς ὅστις ἐγκρατὴς πόδα Ι τείνας ὑπείκει μηδέν, ὑπτίοις κάτω Ι στρέψας τὸ λοιπὸν σέλμασιν ναυτίλλεται, S.*Ant.*715-7; cf. also ἐξώστης Ἄρης Ι ἔθραυε λαίφη τῆσδε γῆς μέγας πνέων, E.*Rh.*322/3; cf. also E.*Or.*341-4; *Hec.*1080-4.

The same idea underlies similes like: δεῖ δ' ὥσπερ ἱστίον τὸ σῶμα μήτε συστέλλειν εὐδίας οὔσης καὶ πιέζειν σφόδρα, μήτ' ἀνειμένως χρῆσθαί τε καὶ καταφρονεῖν ἐν ὑποψίαι γενόμενον, Plut.*Mor.* (*De tuenda sanitate praecepta*) 128F; οὐχ ἥκιστα τοίνυν εὐθυμίαν κολούει τὸ μὴ συμμέτροις χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην δύναμιν ὁρμαῖς ὥσπερ ἱστίοις, ἀλλὰ μειζόνων ἐφιεμένους ταῖς ἐλπίσιν εἶτ' ἀποτυγχάνοντας αἰτιᾶσθαι δαίμονα καὶ τύχην ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν αὑτῶν ἀβελτερίαν, Plut.*Mor.* (*De tranquillitate animi*) 471D; cf. also Plut.*Mor.* (*Quaestiones convivales*) 662C. The association between the winds and fortune in this context—so as to constitute the *ground* of the image—can be further illustrated by the sailor who says: τόλμα καὶ δέδιθι μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἐπιδίδου τῆι Τύχηι τὰ ἱστία καὶ δέχου τὸ πνεῦμα, πιστεύων ὅτι Καίσαρα φέρεις καὶ τὴν Καίσαρος Τύχην, Plut.*Mor.* (*De fortuna Romanorum*) 319C/D. The only instance I found of the image having been used in a context dealing with poetic procedures is a very late one: εἴ τοι μὴ πάντεσσιν ἐπέδραμον, ὡς ποθέεσκον, Ι μηδ' ὅλον ἐξεπέρησα λόγων πόρον, ἱστία τείνας, κτλ, Greg.Naz. *Carmina* p. 1533.8 (Migne, *PG* 37), where the image interacts with the preceding λόγων πόρος; here ἱστία τείνας is probably an image for mentioning everything in full, without restrain, the poet 'letting out his sails' to the merits of his subject matter.

The image has a rich *Nachleben*, testifying, e.g.: *contraxi vela perspiciens inopiam iudicum*, Cic.*Att.*1.16.2; *extremo ni iam sub fine laborum / vela traham*, Verg.*G.*4.116/7 (cf. *ibid.*2.21; Hor.*Epist.*2.2.201); *nunc primum velis, elegi, maioribus itis*, Ov.*Fast.*2.3; *moderatius opta, / et voti, quaeso, contrahe vela tui*, Ov.*Pont.*1.8.71; 'Now Margaret / Must strike her sail, and learn to serve / Where kings command', Shakespeare, *Henry VI*, pt. iii, act 3, sc. 3.5.

πλήρεσιν ἱστίοις is a proverbial expression for 'with all might, with heart and soul', see Suid. *s.v.* ἱστίον (ι 689 II 672 Adler): πλήρεσιν ἱστίοις ἐς τὴν αὐτοῦ σοφίαν καθῆκεν· ἀντὶ τοῦ παντὶ σθένει, πάσηι δυνάμει, ὅληι ψυχῆι (cf. πλήρεσιν ἱστίοις ἐς τὴν ἐκείνου φιλοσοφίαν ἀφῆκεν, Philostr.*VS* 1.25.5). This would not be unsuitable to our context, Pindar urging himself to hoist his sails in order to praise Themistius 'with full sails', i.e., with heart and soul, to the best of his abilities; however, whether the audience thus understood Pindar's imagery here depends upon their familiarity with this proverb, the more so as the wording of the image here does not exactly emphasize the association with it. I found no evidence for the proverb having been in vogue in the classical—let alone the archaic—age[205].

---

[205] *Plenis velis* is not an uncommon expression in Latin (cf. e.g. *plenis velis mors venit*, Quint.*Decl.*12.16; cf. also Petr.45.11, etc.).

On the image of sails see further: Péron, *Images Maritimes*, 49-57; Van Nes, *Maritime Bildersprache*, 7-29.

•*The image of sailing in transitions:* Pindar often expresses the course of his odes in terms of sailing. This may be regarded as a variation of the well-known path-metaphor (see my note on ἵκεις line 50 above and on *N.*3.26/7, p. 303).

When a transition must be made from one theme to another, 'the oar must be held back and the anchor must be dropped from the bows' (κώπαν σχάσον, ταχὺ δ' ἄγκυραν ἔρεισον χθονὶ | πρώιραθε, χοιράδος ἄλκαρ πέτρας· | ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων | ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον, *P.*10.51-4), and the ship is turned around (Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν· ἀπότρεπε | αὖτις Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός· | ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ | παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελθεῖν, *N.*4.69-72; cf. θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπὰν | ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβεαι; | Αἰακῶι σε φαμὶ γένει τε Μοισᾶν φέρειν, *N.*3.26-8). When, like *h.l.*, a new theme must be started up, the Muses can be asked to take care of a favourable wind (ὄφρα...| Μοῖσα,...αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων, *P.*4.2/3; εὔθυν' ἐπὶ τοῦτον, ἄγε, Μοῖσα, οὖρον ἐπέων | εὐκλέα, *N.*6.28/9) and the poet raises his sails to the topmost yard (in order to catch as much wind as possible and to sail at full speed).

•*Semantics:* On the level of the *vehicles* the phrase **ἀνατείνω ἱστία** refers to 'raising the sails.' There are, however, no indications of the expression being the *terminus technicus* for this action. Parallels are scarce and late:

The only real parallel I could find is: ἀνέτεινον τὰ ἱστία καὶ πλήσαντες ἀνέμου πῦρ ἐνέβαλον ἐς τὰ σκάφη, App.*Pun.*467. The rest is circumstancial. The *Suda Lexicon* (α 2274) paraphrases ἀνέντες as ἐνδόντες, ἀνατείναντες, giving the example: οἱ δὲ ἔπλεον τὰ ἱστία τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἀνέντες, from which it can be deduced that for the author of this entry ἀνατείνω was the more usual verb. Presupposing a nautical usage of the verb gives more pregnancy to its occurrence in Claudius Aelianus' description of the ναυτίλος πολύπους[206]: γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς κύμασιν, ὅταν μὲν ᾖι γαλήνη καὶ εἰρήνη πνευμάτων, στρέφει τὴν κόγχην ὑπτίαν (ἣ δὲ ἐπιπλεῖ δίκην πορθμίδος) καὶ παρεὶς δύο πλεκτάνας ἐντεῦθέν τε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ὑποκινῶν ἡσυχῆ ἐρέττει τε καὶ προωθεῖ τὴν συμφυῆ ναῦν. εἰ δὲ εἴη πνεῦμα, τοὺς ἐρετμοὺς μὲν τοὺς τέως προτείνας μακροτέρους οἴακας ἐργάζεται, ἄλλας δὲ ἀνατείνας πλεκτάνας, ὧν μέσος χιτὼν ἐστι λεπτότατος, τοῦτον διαστήσας ἱστίον αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνει, Ael.*HA* 9.34.

In τὴν (*sc.* νῆα) δ' ἄνεμός τε κυβερνήτης τ' ἴθυνε· | τῆς δὲ πανημερίης τέταθ' ἱστία ποντοπορούσης, *Od.*11.10/1, the simplex is used for the 'bulging' of the sails while the ship is at sea. Cf. also ἦρι δ' ἀνεργομένοισιν ἐυκραὴς ἄεν οὖρος, | ἱστία δ' ἤειραν· τὰ δ' ὑπαὶ ῥιπῆς

[206] "The *paper nautilus, Argonauta argo,* a cephalopod mollusc fabled to sail by spreading its membranous arms", LSJ *s.v.* ναυτίλος II, citing also: Arist.*HA* 525a21, 622b5, Call.*Epigr.*6.3, Opp.*H.*1.340. Cf. also Antig.*Mir.*51.

ἀνέμοιο | τείνετο, A.R.2.1228-30. In S.*Ant.*716 (cited above) the simplex is used for pulling the ropes by which the sails are tightened.

Verbs commonly used for 'hoisting' sails include ἀείρω (Hdt.6.14, 8.56, 8.94, etc.; ἐπαείρω [Plut.*Thes*17.4, 22.1, etc.]), ἀνερύω (*Od.*9.77, 12.402, etc.), and ἕλκω (*Od.*2.426, 15.291, *h.Bacch.*26, 32, etc.). The Homeric expression ἀνά θ' ἱςτία λευκὰ πέταςςαν, *Il.*1.480 (cf. *Od.*10.506) may have laid the pattern for the *tmesis* here.

The **καρχάςιον** is the 'mast-top.'[207]

Cf. τοῦ γὰρ ἱςτοῦ τὸ μὲν κατωτάτω πτέρνα καλεῖται, ἧι ἐμπίπτει εἰς τὴν ληνόν, τὸ δ' οἷον εἰς μέςον τράχηλος, τὸ δὲ πρὸς τῶι τέλει καρχήςιον, Asclep.Myrl. *ap.* Ath.11.474f; γλαῦκα δ' ὀφθῆναι διαπετομένην ἐπὶ δεξιᾶς τῶν νεῶν καὶ τοῖς καρχηςίοις ἐπικαθίζουςαν, Plu.*Them.*12; *lucida cum fulgent summi carchesia mali*, Cinna *fr.*4 (Baehrens); cf. also E.*Hec.*1261.

52-53. πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου φθέγξαι ἑλεῖν Ἐπιδαύρωι διπλόαν | νικῶντ' ἀρετάν

Pindar urges himself to record that Themistius won a double victory in Epidaurus, *viz.* both in boxing and in the pancration. I am not sure whether διπλόαν necessarily indicates that he has won both prizes in the same year.[208]

•*Text:* Our two mss. disagree about the cases of the first two nouns: D has πύκτα τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου; B reads πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίωι. D's Doric genitive πύκτα cannot be construed; the accusative (in apposition to νιν) is correct. For the other noun both cases are possible. The 'locative' dative,[209] however, is awkward in combination with the other locative Ἐπιδαύρωι. Moreover, the dative is *facilior:* whereas Pindar exerts himself to vary his expressions, a bare dative is the common expression for 'in the pancration' in the scholiastic tradition (cf., e.g., Σ. *N.*10.87, III 177 Dr.; Σ. *N.*11.24b, III 188 Dr.; Σ. *N.*5.89a, III 98 Dr.; cf. also the titles of *O.*12, 13, *P.*9, 10, *N.*7, 8, *I.*5, 6, 7, 8). The assumption that the genitive is the true reading explains the corruption in D as a common case of assimilation; supposing that B has the correct reading makes it quite difficult to explain the presupposed corruption in D.

Once again symmetry is avoided (cf. introduction, pp. 51/2). Both disciplines in which Themistius has been successful are referred to by nouns, closely connected by τε καί, which have a different syntactical function.

---

[207] L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*, Princeton (NJ) 1971, 232/3: "Along the uppermost part of the mast were fittings to receive the lifts, while somewhat lower was the fitting for the halyard, a heavy collar with eyes affixed to port and starboard to carry the double lines of the halyard. ... On larger craft of both types, the mainmast was stout enough to support a main-top (καρχήςιον, *carchesium*), girdled by a protective railing (θωράκιον)."

[208] Neither is the Σ.*ad loc.* (94b, III 99 Dr.): ὡς διττὰ Ἀςκληπιεῖα νενικηκότος αὐτοῦ ἢ ὡς δύο ςτεφάνους εἰληφότος ἐνὶ ἀγῶνι πυγμῆς καὶ παγκρατίου.

[209] Cf. *N.*11.21. See Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 131/2 (§ 139).

For **τε καί** coordinating syntactically different constituents, cf. e.g. Κλεάνδρωι τις...ἀνεγειρέτω | κῶμον, Ἰσθμιάδος τε νίκας ἄποινα, καὶ Νεμέαι | ἀέθλων ὅτι κράτος ἐξεῦρε, *I*.8.1-5, etc. For **πύκτας**, cf. πύκτας δ' ἐν Ὀλυμπιάδι νικῶν | Ἴλαι φερέτω χάριν | Ἁγησίδαμος, *O*.10.16-8. For **ἑλεῖν** referring to the act of winning, cf. νῦν μὲν αὐτῶι γέρας Ἀλκιμέδων | νίκαν τριακοστὰν ἑλών, *O*.8.65/6; στεφάνοις, | τοὺς ἀριστεύων Φερένικος ἕλεν Κίρραι ποτέ, *P*.3.73/4; ὃς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήσαις | τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἕληι τόλμαι τε καὶ σθένει, *P*.10.23/4. The expression ἑλεῖν ἀρετάν is also found in θεοῦ δὲ δείξαντος ἀρχὰν | ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος, εὐθεῖα δὴ | κέλευθος ἀρετὰν ἑλεῖν, | τελευταί τε καλλίονες, *fr*.108a. For the phrase **διπλόα ἀρετά**, cf. τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῶι διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά, | Φυλακίδ', ἄγκειται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν | Πυθέαι τε, παγκρατίου, *I*.5.17-9. For ἀρετά see further next note.

For the Asclepian Games in Epidaurus see my note on *N*.3.84 (pp. 420/1).

53. ἀρετάν

Pindar's usage of ἀρετά has driven many commentators to despair.[210] The confusing thing about it is the fact that he uses it both as a moral, or physical, quality and for its manifestations. However, much confusion may be avoided by strictly distinguishing the denotation of the noun and the numerous possible translations. ἀρετά denotes 'manliness', a notion covering everything that is admired in a man. Often the reference is no more specific than that: in ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν | καιρόν, *O*.2.53/4, e.g., Pindar states that whealth combined with manliness, with such qualities that are admired in a man, gives opportunity to accomplish things. Sometimes the context gives information about which specific aspect of manliness is referred to, as e.g. in ὃς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήσαις | τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἕληι, *P*.10.23/4, where the context makes clear that admirable physical qualities are meant; or as in πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός, | ἐδόκησέν τε...| ὕπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν, *P*.6.39-43, where the context leads the audience to specify ἀρετά as filial devotion. Such specifications are fully brought about by the context and much of the confusion is avoided when we cease to consider them to be 'different meanings' of ἀρετά.

---

[210] See e.g. Dornseiff, *Pindar übersetzt und erläutert*, Leipzig 1921, 14: "Für Pindar heißt *arete* Glanz, Adel, Ehre, Trefflichkeit, Kraft, Männlichkeit, Fähigkeit, gute Familie, Vorzug, Leistung, Hochsinn, Glück, Reichtum, Gedeihen, Ruhm, das alles schwingt immer in dem Worte mit."; Norwood, 48/9: "his (Pindar's) most fatal irrationality—an ambiguous use of the word *areta*. ... A writer who uses the same word for merit and for success puts himself hopelessly out of court as an exponent of ethics". Cf. also σφόδρα δὲ δεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὀνόμασι προσέχειν, κατὰ πολλὰ πράγματα κινουμένοις καὶ μεθισταμένοις ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν· οἷόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς κτλ, Plu.*Quomodo adul.*,24c/d.

However, it does seem confusing at first sight that Pindar uses ἀρετά also to refer to the results, the manifestations of 'manliness,' like *h.l.* and e.g. ἄνδρα τε πὺξ ἀρετὰν εὑρόντα, *O.*7.89; cf. also ἀνθρώπων...| μαιομένων μεγάλαν | ἀρετὰν θυμῶι λαβεῖν | τῶν δὲ μόχθων ἀμπνοάν, *O.*8.4-7, a description of the contestants at Olympia, who are seeking after success. In these three passages ἀρετά refers to victory. How can the same word be used for merit and for success? This can be understood if we realize that in Homeric and archaic society merit is defined as success. Intentions do not count. Moral and physical quality means nothing until it manifests itself. This is the idea behind ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετὰν | cύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει, *I.*3.13/4: Melissus can be expected, because of the successes of his family (cf. 15-7), to have inborn 'manliness,' but he needs a victory of his own to prove this. In παῖc ὁ Θεαρίωνοc ἀρετᾶι κριθεὶc | εὔδοξοc ἀείδεται Cωγένηc μετὰ πενταέθλοιc, *N.*7.7/8, Sogenes 'is allotted to manliness' because of his victory, the test has been brought to a decision and Sogenes has been judged to possess ἀρετά. A very clear example is: ἀκίνδυνοι δ' ἀρεταὶ | οὔτε παρ' ἀνδράcιν οὔτ' ἐν ναυcὶ κοίλαιc | τίμιαι· πολλοὶ δὲ μέμνανται, καλὸν εἴ τι ποναθῆι, *O.*6.9-11: ἀρετά wins no honour and means nothing when it is not brought to a test, when it is not brought into practice.[211] Honour is fame, fame is what people say, and people speak about successes.[212] So when ἀρετά only counts if it manifests itselfs by means of success, it is not very puzzling that Pindar says 'he has won ἀρετά' about someone who has just won at the Games. A victor 'has won ἀρετά', because he has proved that he has it.[213]

Examples of Pindar saying ἀρετά where we would say success, fame, or glory, are mirrored by an example of him saying glory where we would expect ἀρετά: cυγγενεῖ δέ τιc εὐδοξίαι μέγα βρίθει, *N.*3.40, 'through inborn glory one has the preponderance'. It may be surprising for a modern reader that here glory is said to be inher-

---

[211] Here Pindar is, in a way, stepping out of his own social system, paradoxically uncoupling the two aspects, merit and success, closely interwoven in the word ἀρετά. And he needs the opposition ἀκίνδυνοc vs. πόνοc to distinguish between ἀρετά with and without manifestation in deeds.

[212] This social system is commonly known as a 'shame-culture' (Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, 48/9, gives a brief and to the point description of the way this works in Homeric society). Adkins rightly observes that it is also, and more fundamentally, a 'result-culture' (see *From the Many to the One*, 29ff., 42ff., and *JHS* 89, 1969, 7-21) This system persisted even into the fifth century and later (*Merit and Responsibility*, 154-6).

[213] For the idea of 'reaching' ἀρετά with toil and labour cf. esp. ἔcτι τιc λόγοc | τὰν 'Αρετὰν ναίειν δυcαμβάτοιc' ἐπὶ πέτραιc, | †νῦν δέ μιν θοαν† χῶρον ἁγνὸν ἀμφέπειν· | οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροιcι θνατῶν | ἔcοπτοc, ᾧι μὴ δακέθυμοc ἱδρὼc | ἔνδοθεν μόληι, | ἵκηι τ' ἐc ἄκρον ἀνδρείαc, Sim.*fr.*37 D. (58 B., 386 Page).

ited and that inherited εὐδοξία is said to be the decisive factor for success. One would expect inherited qualities to be presented as such, εὐδοξία being the result that these inborn qualities are aiming at. However, a passage like this goes to show that in the archaic, aristocratic frame of reference quality and glory are closely correlated, so as virtually to be mutually exchangable. It is a well-known fact that in the archaic *Weltanschauung* there is not such a thing as a talent manqué or an unsung hero. A man's qualities are literally non-existent as long as they are not recognized by others.[214] Therefore ἀρετά ad δόξα are virtually one and the same thing.

For an account of ἀρετή in Homer, see Adkins, *Merit and Resposibility*, 31-40; see also *Moral Values and Political Behaviour* (*passim*, for the early fifth century: pp. 60-98). For ἀρετά in Pindar, see, *i.a.*, Gundert, pp. 26 (esp. n. 106, p. 118), 78; Norwood, *loc. cit.*; Dornseiff, *loc.cit.*; Verdenius *ad O.*3.18 (I 21/2). On ἀρετά in Bacchylides: Gundert n. 107, p. 118.

53-54. προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ | ἀνθέων ποιάεντα φέρειν στεφανώματα Both mss. read φέρειν. Wilamowitz' φέρε, printed by Snell-Maehler and Bowra, is unnecessary.[215] φέρειν can be understood as syntactically being on a par with ἑλεῖν (52)[216]: Pindar urges himself to commemorate (φθέγξαι) not only that Themistius won two victories but also that he had the honour to dedicate Pytheas' victory crown in the shrine of Aeacus. In *I.*6.65 Pytheas, Phylacidas (Pytheas' younger brother) and Euthymenes are said to be members of the οἶκος of Themistius. His prominent position within the family of the victor explains why it was his privilege to dedicate the victor's crown.[217] στεφανώματα is a poetic plural referring to Pytheas' single

---

[214] This is what the whole *Iliad* is about, as many have demonstrated. The reason for Achilles to be not amused when Agamemnon took away Briseis is not that he loved her, but that she was a material representation of the Greeks' recognition of Achilles' qualities. Taking her away was the same as taking away this recognition and denying Achilles' qualities. Therefore Agamemnon's manœuvre was unacceptable to Achilles.

[215] With φέρε Pindar urges himself to bring Pytheas' crown to Aeacus' temple, which implies that Pindar was leading a κῶμος which, during or after the song, set foot to Aeacus' temple, where the crown was dedicated. Wilamowitz' conjecture unambiguously connects the dedication of the crown with the performance of the current ode, which makes σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν easier to explain. However, Themistius' dedication, too, could very well have taken place in connection with this performance.

[216] For δέ coordinating two infinitives cf. ἔλπομαι | μὴ χαλκοπάραον ἄκονθ' ὡσείτ' ἀγῶνος βαλεῖν ἔξω παλάμαι δονέων, | μακρὰ δὲ ῥίψαις ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους, *P.*1.43-5.

[217] With φέρε Themistius gets out of the picture as soon as his two victories have been recorded. His grand introduction (50/1) can be understood more easily if he performed a special role in connection with Pytheas' victory.

Nemean crown.[218] Cf. ἐπεὶ χαίταιcι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι cτέφανοι | πράccοντί με τοῦτο θεόδματον χρέος | φόρμιγγα...καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέcιν | Αἰνηcιδάμου παιδὶ cυμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, *O.*3.6-9, with Verdenius *ad loc.*; ζώων ἔτι νεαρὸν | κατ' αἶcαν υἱὸν ἴδηι τυχόντα cτεφάνων Πυθίων, *P.*10.25/6; see also Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, 23-5.

There is one passage, in *N.*8, that may be taken as implying a similar dedication of the victory crown in the shrine of Aeacus in Aegina: ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ cεμνῶν γονάτων πόλιός θ' ὑπὲρ φίλας | ἀcτῶν θ' ὑπὲρ τῶνδ' ἅπτομαι φέρων | Λυδίαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν, | Δείνιος διccῶν cταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα, 13-6. Pindar presents himself as a ἱκέτας, a 'suppliant,'[219] dedicating his ode to Aeacus. He metaphorically calls his victory ode a μίτρα, a 'crown, headband', which victors are decorated with. καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν, 'embroidered with the shrilling noise of flutes,' makes clear unequivocally that the μίτρα is a metaphor for his ode that is presently being sung.[220] This metaphor implies that dedicating a μίτρα to Aeacus was the usual practice, to which the dedication of a

---

[218] The scholia *ad loc.* interpret cτεφανώματα as Themistius' own two crowns (καὶ κομίζειν αὐτὸν τῆι Αἰγίνηι φαιδρὰ τὰ ἄνθη τῶν cτεφάνων μετὰ τῶν Χαρίτων φθέγξαι, 94d [III 99/100 Dr.], and more clearly so 94e, *v.i.*). This is very unlikely. Why would he dedicate his prizes as late as now? And how was he able to preserve them from withering? After all it is more than a year between any Asclepieia and the next Nemean Games. The interpretation of Σ.94e (III 100 Dr.: ἐν τῶι ἡρώιῳ τοῦ Αἰξακοῦ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ, οὗπερ ἐν τοῖc προθύροιc ἀνάκεινται οἱ ⟨ἐξ⟩ Ἐπιδαύρου τοῦ Θεμιcτίου διπλοῖ cτεφάνων) is that Themistius had dedicated his crown already and that they still laid in the portal. This, however, does not go with φέρειν. Bury's interpretation '(proclaim) that he wears grassy flower-chaplets in the portal of Aeacus' fane' (p. 97), is rather ludicrous, Pindar urging himself to proclaim that Themistius stands somewhere alone wearing flowers on his head, unless we follow Bury one step further and assume that it is a statue of Themistius that is standing in the portal of Aeacus' temple, adorned with flowers for the occasion. There is no signal in the Greek indicating that Pindar is talking about a statue, but I am not sure whether we need one. For if indeed the reference is to a statue, Pindar's audience would know this without any help and it can in fact be regarded as functional—presuming that Themistius was dead already—that Pindar conceals this to the effect that Themistius' actual personal presence is suggested. What makes Bury's interpretation attractive, is that it gives the ode as a whole a perfect circular composition: the ode opens with a sculptor and statues (1/2), followed by a maritime picture (2/3); it would be nice if it closed with naval terminology (51), followed by a reference to a statue. Unfortunately, however, the whole idea is surely too far-fetched to be convincing.

[219] The reason for Pindar to present himself as a suppliant may very well have its ground in the story of the Greek envoys coming to Aeacus in order to have him pray to his father. This story was depicted on the Aeaceum (Paus.2.29.7).

[220] Cf. Σ. *ad loc.* For the metaphor cf. *fr.*179, *P.*9.1-4; see also Köhnken, *Funktion des Mythos*, p. 28 with n. 32, Bundy I, p. 21, Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, p. 294 (36). Λυδίαν, then, refers to the musical mode (cf. Αἰολίccιν, *N.*3.79 with my note, pp. 408/9).

song may be compared. Cf. also τοῦτο δὲ προσφέρων ἄεθλον, | ὄρθιον ὤρυσαι θαρσέων, τόνδ' ἀνέρα δαιμονίαι γεγάμεν | εὔχειρα, δεξιόγυιον, ὁρῶντ' ἀλκάν, | Αἶαν, τεόν τ' ἐν δαιτί, Ἰλιάδα, νικῶν ἐπεστεφάνωσε βωμόν, *O*.9.108-12. The victor himself (Epharmostus from Opus) dedicates his crown to the altar of the local hero Ajax and he does so in the context of a δαίς, the Αἰάντεια ἐν Ὀποῦντι, according to the scholiast *ad loc.* Cf. also αἰτέω σε ..., ὦ ἄνα, | ἵλαος ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε σὺν εὐμενίαι | δέξαι στεφάνωμα τόδ' ἐκ Πυθῶνος εὐδόξωι Μίδαι | αὐτόν τε νιν Ἑλλάδα νικάσαντα, *P*.12.1-6; Ζεῦ πάτερ,...δέξαι τέ οἱ (*sc.* Ξενοφῶντι) στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν, τὸν ἄγει πεδίων ἐκ Πίσας, *O*.13.26-9, where the 'institution of crowns, that belongs to the victory κῶμος' is dedicated to Zeus in his capacity of the patron of the venue where the victory had been won.[221]

The Αἰάκειον, the shrine of Aeacaus, situated in the most prominent place of the city Aegina, consisted of four marmor walls surrounding a low altar which was said to mark Aeacus' grave. Pausanias saw the portal serving as its entrance and he says that it was decorated with a relief of the Greek envoys requesting Aeacus to pray for rain (see my note on line 10 above).[222]

For **πρόθυρον**, cf. χρυσέας ὑποστάσαντες εὐτειχεῖ προθύρωι θαλάμου | κίονας ὡς ὅτε θαητὸν μέγαρον | πάξομεν, *O*.6.1-3; Κλεάνδρωι τις ..., ὦ νέοι,...| πατρὸς ἀγλαὸν Τελεσάρχου παρὰ πρόθυρον | ἰὼν ἀνεγειρέτω | κῶμον, *I*.8.1-4; Ματρί, τὰν κοῦραι παρ' ἐμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμὰ | σεμνὰν θεὸν ἐννύχιαι, *P*.3.78/9; ὑδάτ⟨εσ⟩ι δ' ἐπὶ Ἀσωποῦ π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων | βαθύκολπον ἀ[νε]ρέψατο παρθένον Αἴγιναν, *Pae*.6.134-6. *H.l.* is the only instance of πρόθυρον being used of a temple, or *heroon*. Pindar uses the plural **ἄνθεα** to refer to crown won by a victor in: Πυθῶνι δ' ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεὸν | Ἰσθμοῖ τε κοιναὶ Χάριτες ἄνθεα τεθρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων | ἄγαγον, *O*.2.49-51; τῶν (*sc.* ἀέθλων) ἄνθεσι Διαγόρας | ἐστεφανώσατο δίς, *O*.7.80/1; δύο μὲν Κρονίου πὰρ τεμένει, | παῖ, σέ τ' ἐνόσφισε καὶ Πολυτιμίδαν | κλᾶρος προπετὴς ἄνθε' Ὀλυμπιάδος, *N*.6.61-3. **ποιάεις** occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar, but cf. *Il*.2.503, *Od*.4.337, 16.396, S.*OC* 158 (lyr.). ποία, 'greenery,' is the stuff crowns are made of: see my note on *P*.8.19/20 (p. 502). For the combination of ποία and ἄνθεα, cf. τέρεν' ἄνθεα ποίης, *Od*.9.449. The verb **φέρειν** may qualify as 'colourless' (see introduction, pp. 31/2) to the extent that it refers to ded-

---

[221] στεφάνων is a defining genitive, as in Ζεῦ πάτερ ... τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν, | ἄνδρα τε πὺξ ἀρετὰν εὑρόντα, *O*.7.87-9., where ὕμνου τεθμόν refers to the 'ordinance, convention of victory song.'

[222] Ἐν ἐπιφανεστάτωι δὲ τῆς πόλεως τὸ Αἰάκειον καλούμενον, περίβολος τετράγωνος λευκοῦ λίθου. ἐπειργασμένος δέ εἰσι κατὰ τὴν ἔσοδον οἱ παρὰ Αἰακόν ποτε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σταλέντες. ... τοῦ περιβολοῦ δὲ ἐντὸς ἐλαῖαι πεφύκασιν ἐκ παλαιοῦ καὶ βωμός ἐστιν οὐ πολὺ ἀνέχων ἐκ τῆς γῆς· ὡς δὲ μνῆμα οὗτος ὁ βωμὸς εἴη Αἰακοῦ, λεγόμενόν ἐστιν ἐν ἀπορρήτωι, Paus.2.29.6-8.

icating the crown to Aeacus while leaving the technicalities of this procedure to the imagination of the audience; it is cὺν ξανθαῖc Χάριccιν that hints at the way in which this dedication was conducted (see next note); φέρειν itself hardly conveys information in this respect. For a dative with a verb of movement, cf. φάμεν Ἐμμενίδαιc I Θήρωνί τ' ἐλθεῖν κῦδοc, *O.*3.38/9; Φυλακίδαι γὰρ ἦλθον, *I.*6.57; *N.*4.73/4, *N.*2.24, *N.*1.7, etc.

54. cὺν ξανθαῖc Χάριccιν

Themistius dedicated Pytheas' crown 'together with the fair Graces.' The Graces are are responsible for all beauty and pleasure, on earth and among the gods (*O.*14.1-12; cf. also *O.*9.27, *O.*1.30). Collaboration with the Graces guarantees a beautiful spectacle. Themistius did not just dump the crown in the temple but dedicated it in a special way, e.g., with a song and a κῶμοc. Probably the dedication took place in the context of the performance of this ode (cf. e.g. Οὐλυμπιονίκαν I δέξαι Χαρίτων γ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον, *O.*4.8/9; ἐθέλω χαλκάcπιδα Πυθιονίκαν I cὺν βαθυζώνοιcιν ἀγγέλλων I Τελεcικράτη Χαρίτεccι γεγωνεῖν, *P.*9.1-3; εὔχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆcαι cὺν Χαρίτεccι, *N.*9.54).

As Gerber observes (*ad O.*1.18, p. 45), χάριc could be called Pindar's favourite word, appearing at least once in thirty-seven of the fourty-five odes, amounting to a total of at least seventy-five appearances in his œuvre. The usage of χάριc can be devided into two cathegories: First, χάριc, being cognate to χαίρω, is conveniently defined as 'something giving pleasure.' All occurrences traditionally rendered as 'splendour, honour, lustre, glory, favour, blessing, gift, charm, or beauty,' fit in this category, and it is the context, not the noun itself, that is responsible for us preferring one of these translations to any other. The second category consists of those instances where χάριc means 'the act of showing pleasure' and where it is traditionally translated with 'gratitude.' The Χάριτεc, the three Graces (Ἀγλαΐα, Εὐφροcύνα, and Θαλία [*O.*14.13-5]), can linguistically be regarded as a personification of the first category of χάριc. A selection of the numerous discussions of χάριc and the Χάριτεc: O. Loew, *Χάριc*, Diss. Marburg 1908; Wilamowitz, 152; Gundert, 30-76; Van Leeuwen, I 60/1; Latacz, 78-98; K. Deichgräber, *Charis und Charites*, Munich 1971; Gianotti, *Poetica Pindarica*, 69-80; Carne-Ross, 59-66; Steiner, 48-51; B. Maclachlan, *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*, Princeton (NJ) 1993.

For **ξανθόc** see my note on *N.*3.43 (pp. 335/6). For the ending cf. Χάριccιν, B.*Dith.*15.49; θέμιccιν, *P.*4.54; Αἰολίccιν, *N.*3.79.

NEMEAN III

DATE

We have no clue whatsoever for the date of this ode. The scholia say nothing about it. There is no other text external evidence. No ode for another member of the same family has survived. There is no hint at datable contemporary events in the ode.

Resemblances between passages from this ode and the 'Sicilian Odes' (i.e. *O.*1, 2, 3, *P.*2, *N.*9) lead Christ, *SBA* 1889, 52 ff., to place the poem soon after Pindar's return from Sicily.[1] Gaspar (*Essai*, pp. 104-7) used Christ's argument to date *Nemean* 3 to 475. This date, or one close to it, was accepted, if tentatively, by Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 276), Farnell (II, p. 254), Bowra (*Pindar*, pp. 408/9) and in the editions of Puech, Turyn, Snell & Maehler. Others have pointed out other similarities. Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 14/5, provides a convenient overview. The very method of using similarities between various odes as an argument for the date of one of them is invalid, as it has been demonstrated by Pohlsander, *GRBS* 4, 1963, 131-140. Pohlsander (pp. 135-7) shows that it is just as easy to find resemblances between *N.*3 and *P.*4, written in 462 B.C. One could, e.g., also point out similaries between *P.*10, the earliest, and *P.*8, the latest of Pindar's odes (*P.*10.12 and 8.35/6, 44/5; 10.62 and 8.32/3; 10.70/1 and 8.38).

Aristoclidas won the pancration contest in Nemea in the category of men.[2] ὀψέ περ (80) indicates that that some time, more than strictly necessary, has elapsed between the day of Aristoclidas' victory and the performance of this ode. ἐν ἱερομηνίαι Νεμεάδι in line 2 suggests that the performance of this ode took place in the Nemean season nevertheless, which would exclude every even year for the date of the performance of this ode.

It seems unlikely that this ode was performed in the period of Athenian domination of Aegina, from 457 until 447 B.C. No datable Pindaric ode for an Aeginetan has come down from that period. *P.*8 responds to the defeat of Athens at Coronea in 447, when

---

[1] Christ listed resemblances between lines 21/2 and *O.*3.43-5; 29 and *N.*9.6/7; 41/2 with 80-2 and *O.*2.86-8; 65 with *O.*2.89/90; 76 with *P.*2.65-7; 83/4 with *O.*1.93-5. For a detailed examination of Christ's argument see Pohlsander, *GRBS* 4, 1963, 133/4

[2] For more details see my 'Atheletic Age Categories in Victory Odes' (forthcoming).

Aeginetan aristocracy regained their favourable perspectives (see *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-165 and below, pp. 429-31). *P.*8 is the latest dated extant Pindaric ode (446 B.C.). This in itself does not exclude the possibility of *N.*3 being posterior to *P.*8, but the fact that Aegina was again brought under Athenian dominian in 446/5, as a result of the negotiations for the Thirty Years' Peace, makes this unlikely. This results in 457 as a *terminus ante quem* for *N.*3.[3] *P.*10 is the earliest Pindaric ode that can be dated with any certainty. *P.*10 must be dated to 498 B.C. As Pindar was probably born in 518 B.C., it seems unlikely (although not entirely impossible) that *N.*3 is earlier than *P.*10. Any attempt to date *N.*3 with more precision than to any odd year between 498 and 457 B.C. is speculative.

---

[3] Cf. Pohlsander, *GRBS* 4, 1963, 132, 137.

INTERPRETATION

Proem

1-14 *Proem: Invocation of the Muse*

The opening lines of this ode invoke the Muse and explain that her presence is needed in Aegina, 'island of many strangers'[1]: a chorus is waiting for her to supply a song (1-5). Inviting the Muse to come to Aegina (3) gives Pindar the opportunity to mention the victor's place of origin, which is one of the stock ingredients of a victory-ode.

The opening words are partly reminiscent of epic tradition and partly distinguish between epic tradition and the ode to follow. On the one hand, the invocation of one single Muse at the very beginning of an ode is suggestive of epic tradition; on the other, unlike in epic tradition, the Muse is entreated to come to the place where the ode is to be performed.[2] The associations with epic may very well be functional: the ode's main narrative will deal extensively with Achilles, the great epic hero; his exploits before Troy will be dealt with (59-63); Telamon's role in the earlier sack of Troy will be mentioned (36/7). On the other hand, Pindar will address these themes in a way quite distinct from the epic tradition. The main focus will be on Achilles' childhood, which will be presented as prefiguring his great deeds we know about from the *Iliad*. Many implicit references to Homer, and one explicit reference to 'poets of old,' will present Pindar's story as drawing from the *Iliad*—a procedure that emphasizes the similarities as well as the striking differences.

---

[1] The qualification πολυξέναν (2) refers to a principle that was essential for Aeginetan aristocracy: ξενία is of prime importance for a society that depends on over-sea trade. Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 275, rightly observes that the *hyperbaton* adds relief to the qualification. However, I do not believe Erbse's additional suggestion that πολύξεναν also applies to the Myrmidons ("denn diese waren ebenfalls einst Fremde, als sie duch Zeus' Machtspruch aus Ameisen entstanden"); stories like this rather emphasize the autochthony of the people. On the concept of ξενία see also: "Pindar's emphasis ... upon the good conduct of the Aeginetans towards strangers is moreover independent testimony to the large-scale trade of the island in the first part of the fifth century", Amit, *Great and Small Poleis*, 10. See further *N*.5 Interpretation, pp. 62-88. For a detailed discussion see Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 324-32.

[2] Similarly, the qualification πότνια (1) is in itself an epic word, but it nowhere qualifies the Muse in epic tradition.

The next lines explain why a song is needed: 'Everything thirsts for something else; to victory in the Games song belongs best, most favourable attendant on crowns and (deeds of) manliness' (6-8). In line 9, the Muse is asked to supply[3] 'abundance of song' from the poet's μῆτις.[4] This in a way closes the circle: the invitation to the Muse to come to Aegina in 1-3 and the two-step motivation of this prayer in 3-5 and 6-8 together make it clear that the Muse is needed in order to provide a song for celebrating a victory, and this is what she is now asked to do.

'Begin, daughter of the lord of the many-clouded heaven, a quality hymn' (10/1). Now the poet switches to his own role. He promises that, when the Muse provides her song, he will 'make it common to the voices of the μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κώμων νεανίαι and to the lyre' (11/2). He proceeds with a reference to his willingness to undertake his encomiastic task: 'This monument for the country will involve pleasant labour' (12/3). The *oxymoron* χαρίεντα πόνον refers to the 'pleasant labour' on the part of the poet, consisting in creating this 'monument for the country.'[5] The following ἵνα opens a phrase identifying the χώρα as the country 'where of old the Myrmidons dwelt' (13/4).

The triple entreaty to the Muse, ἵκεο (3), ὄπαζε (9), and ἄρχε (10), together with the picture of the chorus waiting for her, in need of her voice (3/5), and the futures κοινώσομαι and ἕξει (12), create the illusion that the ode has not started yet. The proem conjures up the dramatic scene of excited movement and eager expectation for the ode,[6] —which indirectly characterizes the ode as something worth waiting for.

---

[3] The play of words upon ὀπαδόν (8) and ὄπαζε (9) is constitutive of a semantic link between 7/8 and 9. 'Song is the most favourable companion of victory, so abundance of that must now be the companion.' Cf. Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 37, n. 77.

[4] At first sight, there seems to be something contradictory in this entreaty. For a modern reader a song originates either from the Muse or from the poet's mind. The phrasing may just mirror some kind of unspecific awareness of the indispensibility of both technical skill and divine inspiration, without bothering to tell both apart, or it may suggest that the Muse is asked to supply abundant material from which the poet will select and choose by means of his skills.

[5] The associations evoked by ἄγαλμα contribute to this interpretation. As an ἄγαλμα is pre-eminently something large and troublesome to make, like a statue or a monument, the choice of this particular noun to refer to the ode is illustrative of the fact that its creation involves labour.

[6] Thus Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 16: "since ... it is an athletics victory that has occasioned the commotion and eager expectation for the song, an important indirect effect of these openings is the glorification of the victor."

14-21 *Direct Praise of the Victor*

With ἵνα (13) the Myrmidons are introduced and the expectancy is raised that this reference will be elaborated. However, with the relative pronoun ὧν (14) the poet switches back to the present, in order to draw a parallel between the ancient Aeginetan warriors and the victor Aristoclidas: '(the Myrmidons) whose ἀγορά of ancient fame Aristoclidas, according to his destiny, did not sully with disgrace by having become soft in the exceedingly strong expedition of the pancration.' His pancration victory is said not to be a disgrace to his legendary ancestors, renowned for their martial skills. The Myrmidons always operate collectively, which makes it understandable for them to be referred to as the 'gathered' Myrmidons; this presentation involves a great compliment to the victor, as he alone matches the gathered forces of these famous warriors. Why, then, does Pindar use ἀγορά instead of some more common noun for 'host, folk-moot'? The noun ἀγορά evokes strong associations with public life, which is relevant in the light of the fact that Aristoclidas' victory, apparently, had a political dimension to it, as lines 69/70 witness.[7]

By winning the pancration Aristiclidas did great honour to his ancestors, and he did so in accordance with his αἶσα (15/6). It was his αἶσα, his 'role' and 'destiny', to win. ἐὰν κατ' αἶσαν has reference to the fulfillment of the expectancy with respect to Aristoclidas based on the successes of his ancestors, the great Myrmidon warriors. Because of their accomplishments it was Aristoclidas' 'destiny' to win. It is at first sight suprising that ἐάν emphatically presents Aristoclidas' αἶσα as 'his very own' destiny. On closer consideration, however, the emphatic pronoun underscores the unique circumstances of Aristoclidas' victory. First, Aristoclidas managed to win his glory notwithstanding the absence of a trainer's assistance and a strong athletic tradition in his family. Therefore it was his own specific destiny to display the qualities of the Myrmidons, his famous ancestors. To this extent the emphatic possessive pronoun is comparable to the emphasis laid upon the self-reliance of heroes throughout this ode. Second, it was Aristoclidas' own unique destiny to enhance the glory of Aeginetan public life (the *agora*) by means of being victorious, as his victory resulted in him partaking in public life as a

[7] Moreover, the association of the Myrmidons with political activity can be accounted for, though, admittedly, the sources are late; and the agora was, in the days of the Myrmidons, a place where Games took place, so that the choice of the noun may be motivated by the wish on the part of the poet to open the door to an interpretation that Aristoclidas' victory enhanced the glory of the Myrmidons' athletic accomplishments. See my note, pp. 621-3.

thearos (lines 69/70). In sum, ἐάν specifies Aristoclidas' αἶcα, inherent to his being a descendant from the Myrmidons, as his unique αἶcα, inherent to his having been successful without any assistance and to his becoming a *thearos* because of his victory.

'Against fatiguing blows in the low-laying plain of Nemea "hip hip hooray!" brings a healing remedy' (17/8). Victory—symbolised by the victory refrain τήνελλα καλλίνικε (τὸ καλλίνικον, 18) —is presented as a 'medicine' healing the victor of his injuries and of the hardships of training and competition. The medical term used here (ὑγιηρόν) suggests the victor was not just tired. Severe injuries were a harsh reality in the combat sports, especially in the pancration. We may take it that Aristoclidas was badly hurt. The association of καλλίνικοc with Heracles[8] helps to prepare for the transition to Heracles which is to come.

'If Aristophanes' son, being beautiful and doing what fits his bodily form, has set foot upon the highest manhood, yet to travel further is not easy over the untrodden sea beyond the Pillars of Heracles' (19-21). The reference to the victor's beauty has distinct aristocratic connotations, especially as his beauty here is explicitly related to his deeds, which is reminiscent of the old idea that καλόc is what an ἀγαθόc looks like. With his victory, Aristoclidas has exploited the best of those qualities a man competing in the games (or fighting in wars) must have. The εἰ-sentence as a whole is traditionally interpreted as a warning to the victor not to let the victory go to his head and to be careful with further ambitions. However, the unusually specific reference to the victor in the protasis gives rise to the suspicion that there may be more to it. We shall have to come back to these lines.

First Myth: Heracles

22-26 *Heracles*

The verses in which the victor is praised (14-21) lead over into a passage about the achievements of Heracles (22-26). The victor's praise is concluded by the assertion that he has reached the maximum. This is formulated by means of a reference to the Pillars of Heracles

---

[8] Τὸ καλλίνικον is the victory hymn and dance, named after the hymn's refrain τήνελλα καλλίνικε | χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλειc, | αὐτόc τε καἰόλαοc, αἰχμητὰ δύω, Archil.*fr*.324 W.

(20/1), thus occasioning a relative clause in which Heracles is introduced as the subject matter for the next passage: '(the Pillars of Heracles), which the god-hero placed as renowned witnesses of the limit of seafaring' (22/3). Heracles is called a ἥρως θεός, which is a bold juxtaposition. Usually Pindar distinguishes carefully between gods, heroes, and men. Especially the boundaries between mortal and immortal—i.e. between men and heroes on the one hand and gods on the other[9]—are closely heeded. Calling someone a 'god-hero' is a striking *oxymoron*; in the case of Heracles this description is grounded on legend as well as sacrificial practice.[10] The question is, however, why in this context Pindar refers to the ambiguous status of Heracles, both by means of an eye-catching juxtaposition and by means of hyperbaton of the relative pronoun.

Lines 23-6 relate the story of how Heracles came to erect the Pillars: 'He subdued the superior beasts in the sea, and, by himself, he searched for the currents in the shallows, by which way he arrived at his goal, which sent him home; and he made the earth known' (23-6). ἰδίαι (24) underscores that Heracles found them without assistance. Furtheron, several heroes will emphatically be said to have done things single-handed. Heracles reached the point beyond which no man may sail, and marked it by setting up the Pillars. Thus the limits of the earth were defined. The phrase πόμπιμον νόστου τέλος, 'the bounds which send sailors home' (25) turns out also to apply to the poet himself. In line 26 he breaks off this 'digression' about Heracles reaching the end of the world, motivating his thematic conduct in the subsequent lines by stating that it is preferable to deal with Aeginetan heroes instead of Heracles. The Pillars of Heracles send the poet back to his 'home' subject.

The relevance of the Heracles story is one most disputed and indeed one of the most puzzling aspects of this ode. It will be convenient to delay the discussion of this point until we have a better picture of the ode as a whole.

---

9 The distinction between man and hero is sometimes discarded, cf. e.g. *P*.2.29 and 31, where Ixion is called ἀνήρ and ἥρως in one and the same context. See also my note on *N*.5.4. εὐρυσθενής.

10 There is therefore no reason to suspect the reading of the MSS. P. Maas, 'ΗΡΩΣ ΘΕΟΣ', *MH* 11, 1954, 199 ("Das auffällige Oxymoron scheint ohne Parallele. Herakles war Heros, solange er lebte, Gott nach seinem Tod."), proposing the conjecture ἥρως θοός, discards the ambiguity of Heracles' nature as it appears from the testimonia quoted above.

26-32 *Break-off. Transition from Heracles to the Aeacids*

The 'digression' about Heracles (22-6) is broken off. The poet himself intrudes into the poem. He calls upon his θυμός, and asks it what it is doing. At 28 he opposes the right subject-matter, Aeacus and his stock, to the 'wrong' story about Heracles that he has broken off. And, in returning to the positive program, Pindar emphasizes his encomiastic role (lines 29-32), which is presented as a justification of both the break-off and the choice of the new theme.[11] From line 32 he acts upon his promise to deal with Aegina's own heroes.

At 26/7 Pindar metaphorically describes his ode—or, more precisely, its thematic course—in terms of a sea voyage. If the ode is compared to a voyage, an ἄκρα is a place where a voyage may lead to, just as a theme is where the thematic course of an ode leads to. But an ἄκρα is a dangerous place where a ship runs the risk of crashing; and it is the wrong place to go to, as is implied by ἀλλοδαπάν and by παρα-, and most clearly by the very fact that the identity of this place is inquired after. This suggests the image of a ship being off course. ἀλλοδαπὰν ἄκραν also literally refers to the preceding theme, the 'digression' about Heracles, which started and ended with a reference to the Pillars of Heracles. This gives additional significance to the noun ἄκρα, 'cape, headland', being especially suitable to refer to Calpe and Abyla. These capes are 'foreign' from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience. It is wrong in this ode for an Aeginetan victor to deal with 'foreign capes', connected with Heracles, a Theban hero; one should deal with Aegina's own heroes, the Aeacids, instead. In plain words, Pindar calls himself back from a digression he pretends to be irrelevant and makes a transition to the praise of Aeginetan heroes. He does so by concentrating on the location where both stories are set, calling himself back from Gibraltar to Aegina.[12]

'I tell you to bring the Muse to Aeacus and his race' (28), then, formulates the positive program. The transition is motivated: 'Ultimate δίκα, the pick of the bunch of the way it should be, follows the precept "praise the noble". Desires for what belongs to others are not stronger (i.e. better, more preferable) for a man to bear (to live with).

[11] For the emphasis on the poet's encomiastic role in break-off passages, cf. e.g. *O.*9.83/4, *O.*13.97, *N.*6.57b, *I.*6.57.

[12] This transition is in a way prepared for by πόμπιμον ... νόςτου τέλος (25), 'the bounds which send men home', which appears also to be true for the poet himself. This point is stressed by means of οἴκοθεν in line 31. See also Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 153-162; Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, 49/50.

Search for what comes from your (own) home' (29-31). The train of thought is as follows: 'Why do you praise Heracles, who has nothing to do with Aegina? I tell you to praise Aeacus and his race. To praise noble men, such as Heracles and the Aeacids, is always a very just thing to do, but one should not long for what belongs to others. Look for something of your own to praise.' The sentence in which δίκα occurs is part of a transitional passage, motivating the shift that occurs from Heracles to the Aeacids. The ideal manifestation of the way it should be follows the precept 'praise the noble.' The next sentence (line 30) forms a limitation of this concept, stating that, though this is very true, it is not good to indulge oneself in foreign glory. Together both sentences (29/30) motivate the break-off, by giving the reason for preferring the Aeacids over Heracles, while making perfectly certain that the poet is not misunderstood and accused of underrating the great god-hero. So in their direct context these lines have reference to poetic procedures; and consequently, δίκαc ἄωτοc refers to the utmost realisation of the way it should be in poetry, i.e., praising the man who deserves to be praised, which, in this context, applies to Heracles as well as to the Aeacids.[13] On the other hand, these statements are gnomic, which means that they are meant to apply to *any* situation, not merely the situation that prompt their formulation. Lifted out of their immediate context—and gnomic statements are meant to have a wider application than their immediate context alone, because of their generic pretentions—, lines 29/30 formulate a fundamental aspect of aristocratic ethics: ἐcλὸν αἰνεῖν (29) is the way it should be. Thus, this precept is not only the shortest possible description of what Pindar's own poetry is all about, but also contains in a nutshell how aristocracy wants the world to be, the happy few, the ἐcλοί, running the show, and being praised for that. Line 30, in this connection, is all but directly addressed to the have-nots, in that it states that things should stay the way they are.[14] So δίκα here refers to 'the way should be', both in an epinicion and in society in general; the direct context of which lines 29/30 are a part steers the hearer to

---

[13] The idea covered by the notion δίκα in such contexts is quite obvious: 'the way it should be' is that a man who has made great accomplishments must be praised for them (the χρέοc motif, see my note on *P.*8.33, pp. 513-5).

[14] A manifestation of δίκα is the willingness to conform to generally accepted standards in case of conflict and not to use violence, i.e. to avoid ὕβριc and βία. So it is Dika who must see to it that the members of a society recognize the division of power and property as agreed upon and do not attempt to increase their own power and/or property by means of violence. As δίκα is often invoked in justification of maintaining the existing situation or of returning to a previous status quo, it carries conservative connotations. See my note on *P.*8.1 (p. 468).

apply the notion in the former way, while the generic character of the utterance in combination with what may be called the pragmatic context of the performance of the ode (a scion of a noble family being praised in the presence of the entire Aeginetan community, a situation that visualizes the supposed superioriy of the happy few[15]) guides him to apply it in the more general way.

In the context of the break-off passage, οἴκοθεν μάτευε (31) is ironic from the mouth of a Theban poet. The context makes clear that οἴκοθεν is used from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience, referring as it does to the Aeginetan mythical arsenal as opposed to the story about Heracles. In this passage, however, Pindar addresses himself, and if οἴκοθεν had been said from Pindar's own perspective, it should have referred to what comes from Thebes. This gives an ironical twist to the break-off: Pindar breaks off a story about a Theban hero on the ground of its not being an Aeginetan story; in directing himself to Aeginetan themes he says 'look for what comes from home.' Similarly, unmistakable associations with Heracles are evoked in the lines devoted to Telamon (36-9, see below). This is irony to the extent that there is a clash between what the poet says he is doing and what he is in fact doing: he says he is turning away from Heracles because he is an unfit subject for the present purpose, but in fact he continues to allude to this hero. This is an intellectual game the poet is playing, and the audience is supposed to see through it.[16]

Lines 31/2, then, motivate why looking at home is a sensible thing to do: 'Contributory adornment you have, to sing something sweet'. The ποτίφορος κόσμος refers to the material of stories about Aeginetan heroes, which is 'contributing' to the aims of the present ode according to the principles formulated in the preceding lines. The statement implies a compliment to the richness of Aegina's legend, or rather to its glorious past.

Æacid Myths

32-36 Peleus

The remainder of this second triad and the entire third triad are devoted to the glory of the Aeacids, as we have been promised in line 28. 'Lord Peleus rejoices in ancient prowess' (32/3) introduces the first Aeacid we shall hear about. Peleus' ἀρεταί are παλαιαί from the per-

---

[15] This idea is thematized in a special way in *P.*8. See pp. 431-56.

[16] On irony in break-off passages see also Introduction, pp. 36/7.

spective of the moment the ode is performed. παλαιαῖϲι signals that the poem moves from the present to the past. The emphasis on the *single-handed* capture of Iolcus (34) deviates from the tradition.[17] Here, once more, a hero is emphatically said to have done something *alone*, without the help of others, even if tradition does record the assistance of others. Peleus' single-handed capture of Iolcus is mirrored by the way in which Achilles' accomplishments at Troy will be told (59-63). Achilles is portrayed there as doing everything alone. Not a single reference is made to the Greek army or to any other hero standing at Achilles' side in the Trojan war. The fact that Peleus was Achilles' father is underlined by means of the reference to his subjection of Thetis (35/6), a reference that will recur in the context of the Achilles story, where Achilles is explicitly said to be Thetis' son (56/7). The allusions to Thetis' resistance by means of κατέμαρψεν and ἐγκονητί add to the glory of Peleus' achievement. ἐγκονητί also evokes associations with wrestling and the pancration, to the effect that Peleus' subjection of Thetis mirrors, prefigures, and explains Aristoclidas' pancration success, thus presenting Aristoclidas as having displayed the same qualities as his illustrious ancestors.

The assertion in the participle clause ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών (33) is a bold trick played by the poet. Peleus' famous spear, used by Achilles in the *Iliad*, had been cut by Chiron; it was in fact his wedding-gift to Peleus. It must have struck Pindar's audience, who must have been familiar with the relevant passages in the *Iliad*,[18] that the poet credits Peleus here, rather than his tutor, with the manufacturing of the spear. Moreover, reference to this weapon appears to be a rather irrelevant detail. One solution to the latter problem is that all three Aeacids mentioned have a spear: Peleus his famous αἰχμά, Telamon a metaphorical spear, namely his ἀκμὰ φρενῶν (39); Achilles, when only six years old, sways his βραχυϲίδαρον ἄκοντα (45). These details, details as they may be, help suggest the continuity in the family. The fact that Peleus' famous spear, as the audience know, is later used by Achilles at Troy only goes to emphasise this point[19]. The former prob-

---

[17] The scholiast on this line (57, III 51 Dr.), quoting Pherecydes (*FHG* I 78 J.), as well as Apollod.3.13.7, mentions Jason and the Dioscuri as his helpers. Moreover, Apollodorus mentions an army (Πηλεὺϲ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ϲὺν Ἰάϲονι καὶ Διοϲκούροιϲ ἐπόρθηϲεν Ἰωλκόν, καὶ Ἀϲτυδάμειαν τὴν Ἀκάϲτου γυναῖκα φονεύει, καὶ διελὼν μεληδὸν διήγαγε δι' αὐτῆϲ τὸν ϲτρατὸν εἰϲ τὴν πόλιν).

[18] *Il.*19.387-91, 16.140-4. The story seems to have been related in detail by the poet of the *Cypria* (see Σ.*ad Il.*16.140).

[19] I do not believe Hubbard's suggestion (*Pindaric Mind*, 42), that Achilles' "βραχυϲίδαρον javelin represents limitation in comparison with his father's ὑπέραλλον spear (which sought to exceed all precedent)."

lem has a wider impact. Again we have a hero here who is said to have done everything alone, even if tradition knows otherwise. The same is true for the reference to Peleus' subjection of Thetis. The role played by Chiron in this adventure is not recorded. This is not in itself distressing, but the event will be presented from his perspective in lines 56/7 below. Moreover, the mentioning of Peleus' famous spear very clearly evokes associations with Chiron, to the effect that he is already present in the audience's minds. We shall have to come back to the theme of heroic self-sufficiency and to Chiron's role.

36-39 *Telamon*

Now Pindar focuses upon the second Aeacid of the first generation. Two of the three accomplishments by Telamon recorded in lines 36-9 are mirrored in the story about Achilles. Telamon, like Achilles, fought successfully at Troy (36/7, 59-63). The emphasis upon Telamon's unflinching courage in line 39 prefigures Achilles' exceptional bravery as depicted in lines 60-3. Moreover, it is suggested that Telamon's and Achilles' courage live on in Aristoclidas' courage, who did not 'become soft' (16)[20].

The account of Telamon's deeds is just as delusive as the preceding lines about Peleus, though in a different way. 'Telamon of wide strength destroyed Laomedon, being Iolaus' comrade in arms, and he followed him once in pursuit of the valorous bronze-bowed Amazons and never did terror that conquers man stop the point of his spirit' (36-40). The most striking characteristic of the short allusion to the sack of Troy by Heracles and his companions here is that Heracles himself is not mentioned at all. The killing of Laomedon is attributed to Telamon, instead of to Heracles as tradition has it; and, instead of at least mentioning Heracles as Telamon's comrade in war Pindar only mentions Iolaus, Heracles' charioteer. If the story in itself did not evoke strong associations with Heracles on the part of the audience, the mentioning of Iolaus certainly did. Telamon is presented as 'Iolaus' flank officer, his comrade in arms.' This implies that Iolaus was the leader of the expedition and that Telamon was serving under his command. This is striking, since in fact Heracles was the leader of this expedition against Troy (cf. *N.*4.25, *I.*5.37). Moreover, if Pindar wished to highlight the achievements of Telamon by not mentioning Heracles, it is even more striking that he presents Telamon as serving under the command of a man infe-

[20] Thus Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 157.

rior to Heracles. Telamon's expedition against the Amazons is in itself suggestive of his fighting abilities, as the Amazons were reputed adversaries. But the story of Telamon following Iolaus in pursuit of the valorous Amazons is in defiance of tradition too. This expedition was undertaken under the leadership of Heracles. In fact, the fetching of Hippolyta's girdle has been canonized as Heracles' ninth labour. Among his comrades were, apart from Telamon, Iolaus, Peleus, and, according to some accounts, Theseus.[21] Moreover, tradition has hardly recorded any special merit on the part of Telamon in the course of this expedition and none on the part of Iolaus.[22]

Erbse (*Hermes* 97, 1969, 278/9) argued that Pindar replaces Heracles with Iolaus by deliberate design in order to represent Telamon's expeditions as truly Aeginetan deeds and thus "dem Schatten des gewaltigen Herakles ausweichen." If Pindar really had wanted to *dissociate* Telamon's deeds from Heracles, he would have chosen a rather awkward way of doing so. Iolaus is "almost a metonomy for Heracles himself," as Hubbard (*Pindaric Mind*, 40, n. 86), rightly observes. The reference to Iolaus is very clearly aiming at *associating* Telamon with Heracles. Pindar does so by mentioning Iolaus, because "to bring in Heracles by name would be awkward just after having promised not to talk about him any further" (Hubbard, *ibid.*). The entire Telamon passage is designed in order to evoke associations with Heracles. I shall return to Heracles' role in this ode below.

40-42 *Gnomic Passage: Inborn Glory versus Things Learned*

'Through inborn glory one has the preponderance. Who has things learned, is a man in the dark, now breathing this, then that. He does not ever step down with sure foot and he has a taste of countless ways to distinguish himself with his ineffectual mind.'[23] Through inborn glory one has opportunities to achieve things. Who, on the other hand, does not follow his inborn capacities, is a man without

---

[21] Σ.*ad h.l.*, quoting Hes.*fr.*278; *fr.*172, Apollod.2.5.9, Plut.*Thes.*26, Justin.2.4.

[22] According to most accounts Heracles himself single-handedly killed each of the Amazon leaders (D.S.4.16, Apollod.2.5.9, Plut.*Quaest. Gr.*45). Only the Hesiod passage (*fr.*278) quoted by the scholiast (64b, III 52 Dr.) records that Telamon killed Melanippe, Hippolyta's sister.

[23] "Diese Worte sind mir wie Schwerter durch die Seele gegangen. Ihr wißt nun, wie's mit mir aussieht ...", Wolfgang von Goethe in a letter (10 July 1772; Grumbach, *Goethe und die Antieke*, Berlin 1949, I, p. 226; cit. Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 282, n. 1).

fame, with varying ambitions, never walking steadily on a straight road, but merely with a taste of countless ways of distinguishing himself, without, however, accomplishing his aims. Such a man is someone without guidance to hold on to, feeling tempted to vainly try his luck in numerous activities for which he lacks the capacities.[24] It is remarkable that the positive side of the opposition here is not expressed in terms of φυά, but explicitly as the 'glory that goes with the γένοϲ'. Pindar here expresses the power of inheritance even more pregnantly than in comparable passages in other odes (e.g., *O.*2.83-8, *O.*9.100-8, *N.*1.25-8, *N.*7.54-8).

It has been observed before that the gnomic passage provides the key to understanding the connection between the stories of the three Aeacids.[25] "Pindar's account has revealed the same qualities in Peleus and Telamon, both sons of Aeacus (stressed in v. 28), and ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία is a fitting term to use of two members of a family who show the same characteristics", and "the myth of Achilles follows naturally on this *gnome.* As the son of Peleus his claim to ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία needs no explanation."[26] Many of the details Pindar selects to relate in each of the three stories emphasize the continuity of qualities within the family. Moreover, ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία entails the highly complimentary suggestion that Aristoclidas' victory is a continuation of the successes of his illustrious ancestors.[27] The relevance of the gnomic passage in 40-2 to the victor is stressed by means of the fact that "the description of the failure in 41 ff. contains two expressions which suggest athletics, an indication that this man is meant to contrast the endurance of Aristoclides. καταβαίνω can mean 'enter the list'. ἀτρεκεῖ ποδί suggests the ability of the

---

[24] The idea of superiority of ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία entails a justification of the very principles of aristocracy. The concept applies to every human activity, so also to political activities. Only those men should rule who have the right φυά for it. A man's φυά is determined by his birth. Only those who are born rulers have the right to foster political ambitions. The whole concept is a categorical denial of social mobility. It is *suum cuique* to its ultimate conclusion.

[25] Of course, lines 40-2 do not contain a reference to Pindar's superiority over his rivals, as Bury (I p. 32) and Ruck (*Hermes* 100, 1972, 157) supposed. Admittedly, by virtue of their general formulations, gnomic passages like this pretend to apply to every human activity; however, their relevance to poetic ambitions is not alluded to in the context by any means. Cf. Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 41, with n. 88.

[26] Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158. Some critics have failed to appreciate even this obvious function of the *gnome*: "Dann kommt sein Bruder Telamon mit seinen bekannten Herrfahrten; an ihn wird ziemlich gewaltsam der Spruch aus Ol. 2, 86 geknüpft; es drängte den Pindar, seinen Glauben an die Überlegenheit der Begabung über alle angelernte Kunst auch hier zu bekennen.", Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, 280.

wrestler or pancratiast to trip his opponent without himself being tripped" (Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158).

43-53 *Achilles (Part I): Achilles' Childhood*

Lines 43-52 relate the astonishing exploits of the six-year-old Achilles, the great deeds he accomplished, as child's play (ἄθυρε, 44), when he stayed with Chiron (43/4). 'Throwing his short spear with an iron point with his hands, many times and with the speed of the winds, he dealt death in battle to wild lions and he slew boars' (46/7). Achilles' age illustrates the validity of the preceding gnomic statements about innate quality being superior to learning. "Since he is a child (44), the qualities he reveals must be innate, not acquired"[28]. The entire passage (43-52) is designed to present Achilles' 'great deeds' when he was a child as prefiguring the mighty exploits he accomplished as a man during the Trojan war. The image of the young boy Achilles outrunning deer does so very clearly and explicitly, for it endows the young boy with the most characteristic quality of the ποδὰϲ ὠκὺϲ Ἀχιλλεύϲ of the *Iliad*.[29] μάχαι (46), evoking associations with the battlefield rather than with hunting, helps to present Achilles' exploits in his childhood as prefiguring his great deeds before Troy. The same is true for ἔναιρε (47), which by virtue of both its denotation and the context in which it most frequently occurs, evokes associations with the battlefields at Troy. By constantly evoking associations with the *Iliad* in his description of Achilles' youth and by endowing the young Achilles with the same qualities the man Achilles had according to the *Iliad*, Pindar suggests the continuous, inborn character of such qualities.

'He brought their panting bodies to Cronus' son, the centaur' (47/8) illustrates the strength of the young Achilles, as it is no picnic for a toddler to drag dead lions and boars to caves; at the same time, it is suggestive of Achilles' reverence for his tutor and teacher.

ἑξέτηϲ τὸ πρῶτον in line 49 is a temporal specification of the entire preceding story. It picks up τὰ μέν in line 43. And Achilles continued doing so the rest of his life (ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον, 49). Thus Pindar

---

[27] Thus Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158.

[28] Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158.

[29] The verbal repetition ποϲϲί (52) ~ ποδί (42) may be aiming at contrasting Achilles to the ψεφηνὸϲ ἀνήρ and at thus stressing the applicability of the gnomic passage to Achilles. Thus Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 159; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 42; Froidefond, *Lire Pindare*, 1. Similarly, ἴϲα τ' ἀνέμοιϲ (45) may contrast ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων (41).

explicitly relates the deeds of the young Achilles to his famous exploits before Troy. Achilles did not litterally continue to kill boars and lions and bring them to Chiron, but he did continue to display the same qualities he displayed as a child, though in a different context.

Achilles' child's play astonishes even Artemis and Athena (50). Artemis' appearance in this part of the poem is motivated by her being the divine huntress (cf. e.g. *Il.*5.51/2, *Od.*6.104). Athena has a special relationship with Achilles in the *Iliad*, advising him not to draw his sword on Agamemnon (*Il.*1.207 ff.), and helping him on many occasions (*Il.*18.203-21, 19.352-4, 20.94, 438-40), including her crucial role in Achilles' battle with Hector (*Il.*22.214-305). "Athena's epithet 'bold' indicates the aspect of his character that she particularly admired."[30] Artemis and Athena were amazed that Achilles was able to kill deer, animals notorious for their running speed, without the usual aids for catching animals that easily outrun any normal human being. Achilles, like Heracles and Peleus (see above), is emphatically said to have done things on his own, without the help of anybody or anything.

Now the poet himself intrudes into the story: 'I have (know) this story (that has just preceded) as one that has been told by men of old' (52/3). τοῦτο ... ἔπος refers to the story about Achilles' miraculous exploits as a child that has just been told. προτέρων must refer to earlier authorities for this story.[31] Ironically, Pindar is our earliest authority for this story; although we shall never be able to establish with certainty that Pindar did not indeed know the story from an earlier source, now lost to us, the evidence suggests that it is his own invention.[32] Pindar pretends that he draws his material from earlier authorities. Thus, the reference is fictional, also to the extent that the audience would see through Pindar's pretence. On the level of the fiction, the reference to earlier authorities has the function of giving support to Pindar's story, which is functional since the surprizing statements about the accomplishments of the six year old boy are liable to disbelief.[33]

---

[30] Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, p. 168.

[31] Referring back προτέρων to the subject matter of this ἔπος ('I have this story that is told about men of old'), Achilles being one—and the only one mentioned—of the πρότεροι, is unlikely, for such an assertion is unfunctional in the context. That the poet 'has' this story is clear enough from the very fact that he has just related it.

[32] See my note on lines 43-52 'Mythological Background' p. 335. This may very well have been the reason for scholars not to take τοῦτο anaphorically, as it must be.

[33] Cf. Farnell *ad loc.* (p. 259): "this is said in apology for his statement of the boy's miraculous fleetness".

On the level of Pindar's real compositional concerns the reference has a different function. The entire passage about Achilles' youth is designed to present his childhood playing as prefiguring his great deeds described in the *Iliad.* Pindar effects this by using a vocabulary that is to a high degree reminiscent of epic diction (of the *Iliad* in particular), by using verbs for the killing of beasts that are more approriate for the killing of men—and which, therefore, present the killing of beasts as prefiguring the killing of men—, and, especially, by endowing the young boy with the most characteristic quality of the ποδὰς ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς of the *Iliad.* The implicit references to the *Iliad* guide the audience to associate the πρότεροι, the 'poets of old,' with Homer. Thus Pindar's claim, to be in agreement with 'poets of old,' has the effect of emphasizing the similarities between his story about the young Achilles and the story about Achilles the man as it is told in the *Iliad:* it helps to draw the parallel between the boy and the man. In other words, Pindar says: 'When Achilles was six years old, he killed beasts and outran deer, as we all know from Homer', while in fact the only thing we know from Homer is that Achilles, as a man, killed a lot (of enemies rather than animals) and that, as a man, he was famous for his running speed (outrunning his enemies rather than deer). By treating this factual discrepancy as a trifle, or even as non-existent, Pindar makes his point precisely. Thus the qualities eminent in the boy are presented as identical to the ones the man possesses, and thus qualities in general are considered to be a constant factor, unvarying with a man's age, which is the point of the Achilles story and a main theme in the ode as a whole. This point is elaborated upon in the gnomic passage in lines 70-5.

53-64 *Achilles (Part II): Chiron & Achilles as a man*

At 53, the focus of the story shifts from Achilles to his tutor Chiron. Some of Chiron's accomplishments as an educator are mentioned: 'Profoundly wise Chiron nursed Jason inside his stone dwelling, and next Asclepius, whom he taught the soft-handed use of herbs' (53-5). "The two heroes mentioned in 54f. form a priamel-like introduction to the continuation of the Achilles-myth, sketching in the glorious paedeutic tradition which lies behind the specific training of Achilles" (Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 159). The mention of Jason and Asclepius is given relevance in the light of lines 14-8. Jason is a hero who is preeminently known for his great expedition after the Golden Fleece.[34]

[34] Thus also Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 43.

Thus his story also mirrors Aristoclidas' 'expedition' to Nemea. Both expeditions have in common that they are dangerous and that their reward was invaluable. Chiron's superior qualities as an educator are compellingly illustrated by the fact that he is said to be responsible for the characteristic for which Asclepius is most renowned and which was associated with Asclepius more than with anyone else. Moreover, Aristoclidas had earlier won at the Asclepian Games in Epidaurus (84). If we have rightly deduced from the medical terminology used in 17/8 that Aristoclidas was wounded, the mentioning of the divine healer gets a third, additional layer of relevance.

'Then again he arranged a wedding for Nereus' daughter with splendid breasts'. The daughter of Nereus meant here is Thetis, who married Peleus. The epithet ἀγλαόκολπον emphasizes her physical beauty, which is functional in a nuptual context. νυμφεύω is surprizing, as Chiron did not 'betroth' Thetis in the technical sense, not being related to her. Moreover, epic tradition has recorded Hera as the arranger of the marriage of Thetis to Peleus.[35] The wedding was celebrated on Mount Pelion, at Chiron's cave.[36] One might imagine Chiron to have played the role of host during the wedding festivities.[37] In later tradition, Chiron is known to have advised Peleus how to subdue Thetis.[38] Be that as it may, just as Peleus and Telamon above, Chiron is given credit that is hardly justified in tradition. Another striking effect of mentioning the 'betrothal' here is that it sheds a new light on the reference to the same event earlier in this ode (35/6), where the subjection of Thetis is wholly ascribed to Peleus himself, without any hint at the fact that Chiron played a role in this event (see below).

Then Pindar returns to Achilles, also raised by Chiron (57/8). This brings us back to the point where the narrative started in line 43. Chiron educated Achilles, teaching him everything a man of his position and with his destiny needs to know, increasing his physical and mental strength ('making his θυμός grow with respect to all proper things', 58). Chiron's education of Achilles is presented as

---

[35] *Il.*24.59-61.

[36] For the wedding on Mount Pelion, see *N.*5.22 (with my note, p. 137), *P.*3.84-96, E.*IA* 701-7, *Il.*16.143-51, 18.82-5, 24.534-7, E.*IA* 1036-79; Apollod.3.13.5; *Cypria* quoted by Σ.*ad Il.*16.140, etc.

[37] This seems to be confirmed by *I.*8.41, where Zeus, having decided to bestow Peleus with the honour of marrying Thetis (38-40), gives the order to inform Chiron (ἰόντων δ' ἐϲ ἄφθιτον ἄντρον εὐθὺϲ Χίρωνοϲ αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαι). Cf. πάνταϲ ἐϲ γάμον μάκ[αραϲ καλέϲϲαιϲ] | ἄγετ' ἐκ Νή[ρ]ηοϲ ἔλων [μελάθρων] | πάρθενον ἄβραν | ἐϲ δόμον Χέρρωνοϲ, Alc.*fr.*42.6-9 V.

[38] Apollod.3.13.5, Ov.*Met.*11.229-40.

having been intended (ὄφρα, 59) to prepare him for the expedition to Troy. The participle clause 'sent close up under the walls of Troy by the sea-blasts of the winds' (59) provides a new local and temporal orientation, making it clear that the story now focuses on Achilles' deeds as a man. The first of the two goals of Chiron's education is that Achilles must learn to stand his ground on the battlefield of Troy (60/1). The three peoples mentioned are exemplary for the host of enemies Achilles had to face. The unparallelled expression δορίκτυπον ἀλαλάν vividly conjures up the horrors of the battlefield. 'Mingling his hands with the spear-carrying Ethiopians' (61/2), then, gives a second, more specific orientation: the narrative now focuses on one of the latest stages of the Trojan war, when the Ethiopians appeared on the scene. The second aim of Chiron's education, then, is that 'he should fix it in his heart, i.e. that Achilles would have the firm determination, that the Ethiopian king Memnon would not come home' (62/3). The killing of Memnon by Achilles is the climax the narrative has been leading up to. Emphasis on the qualities of Achilles' opponent, by means of qualifying him as ζαμενής (63), 'very fierce', adds to Achilles' glory. The presentation is quite complex. The death of Memnon is alluded to by his not coming home again, which is not stated as a historical fact but presented as a firm determination on Achilles' part, which in turn is said to be one of the aims of Chiron's education.

By focusing mainly upon expeditions undertaken by the Aeacids, Pindar implies not only continuity of activities (and therefore of qualities) within the Aeacid stock, but also a parallel between the Aeacids and the victor, whose partaking in the Nemean Games has been described in terms of an expedition (περιcθενεῖ ... cτόλωι, 16/7), to the effect that it is suggested that the εὐδοξία has stuck to the γένοc, up to and including the victor who is presently being celebrated.

It is not unimportant that Achilles seems to do everything alone here. Not a single reference is made to the Greek army or to any other hero at Achilles' side in the Trojan war: it is he against a host of hostile nations (60-3). Similarly, Heracles is emphatically said to have found his way to Cádiz ἰδίαι, 'on his own' (24). Peleus took Iolcus μόνοc ἄνευ cτρατιᾶc (34). Achilles does not need dogs or traps in order to catch deer (51). Bury (pp. 39/40, 55) was the first scholar to pay attention to this *Leitmotiv*. It is clear that the these heroes doing things alone mirror Aristoclidas' self-reliance. The formulation of his victory in 16/7 in terms of him standing his ground alone in the midst of a fierce expedition at Nemea is recalled by the picture of Achilles facing his enemies at Troy alone. But what is the

reason for thematizing Aristoclidas' self-sufficiency in this ode? Carey suggests it is the victor's "endurance" that is being thematized and parallelled by heroes doing things on their own (see esp. pp. 159/60). But self-sufficiency is not the same as endurance. The emphasis upon self-sufficiency in this ode must be motivated by the circumstances of the victory celebrated. Aristoclidas did not have a trainer; otherwise he would have certainly been mentioned.[39] Aristoclidas owed his successes completely to himself, just as the heroes in this ode accomplish great deeds without the help of others. The fact that his family, including his father Aristophanes, did not have a successful athletic career may also fit in this picture.[40]

The narrative is closed off by a sentence presenting the relevance of the related past in the light of the present: 'From here the far shining light of the Aeacids is firmly fixed' (64), i.e. 'a world-wide impact has the fame of the Aeacids, finding its origin here on Aegina'. Due to Achilles the Ethiopians lost their king. The Ethiopians were confronted with the qualities of the Aeacids, as represented by Achilles. Thus the fame of the Aeacids pervened even to Ethiopia, which is as far as it can possibly reach, for the Ethiopians are the ἔcχατοι ἀνδρῶν.

The Final Triad

65-70 *Invocation of Zeus. Direct Praise of the Victor*

'Zeus!—for it is your blood and yours are the Games, which the hymn has struck with voices of youths celebrating domestic delight' (65/6). The γάρ clause explicitly gives the motives for invoking Zeus: as Aeacus' father, he is the primogenitor of the Aeacids and of all Aeginetans claiming their descent from them, including, without doubt, the present victor;[41] and the Nemean Games were held in

[39] Aristoclidas competed in the age category of men. It is sometimes assumed that ἄνδρεc did not use trainers, but cf. *O*.8.56-9, *I*.4.70-4 (where παίδων ⟨τε⟩ τρίταν | πρόcθεν makes clear the victory celebrated by this ode is a man's victory), *I*.5.59-61. For more details see my 'Athletic Age Categories in Victory Odes' (forthcoming).

[40] Mutual assistance within families with a strong athletic tradition was not uncommon. An example of such a family is the one of which Themistius, Euthymenes, Lampon, Pytheas, and Phylacidas were a member (*N*.5, B.13, *I*.6, *I*.5). Pytheas, himself a succesful athlete, and celebrated as such in *N*.5 and B.13, later acted as Phylacidas' trainer (*I*.5). See *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32.

[41] See also *N*.5.7/8 and 43 with my notes *ad loc.*

honour of Zeus.[42] The invocation of Zeus in 65, directly following the Achilles story, is a device for effecting the transition and the connection between the mythical past and the present occasion for which the ode is being sung. These lines are reminiscent of 10-3 above.[43] Ζεῦ (65) recalls οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι (10), the reference to the voices of the chorus is repeated (ὀπὶ νέων, 66, and βοά, 67, recall κείνων ... ὀάροιϲ, 11), and ἐπιχώριον χάρμα (66) recalls χώραϲ ἄγαλμα (13). Both 10-3 and 65-7 introduce direct praise of the victor, linking his individual success closely to the honour it involves for Aegina. The resumption here of the introduction of the praise of the victor in 10-3 serves as an additional signal that the narrative section of the ode has come to an end and creates the expectation that we will focus upon Aristoclidas again. The present hymn has 'struck' Zeus' Games as well as Zeus' offspring, which suggests a link between Aristoclidas' Nemean victory and the stories about the Aeacids that have preceded. This connection is also suggested by the recurrent light imagery. The 'far-shining' light of the Aeacids (64) is mirrored in the light shining for Aristoclidas (83/4); both contrast the 'darkness' of the unsuccessful man who lacks innate capacities (41/2).[44]

Line 67 further elaborates upon the ὕμνοϲ mentioned in the preceding lines. Due to the ambivalence of the verb πρέπει, line 67, by the poet's design, lends itself to two interpretations. First, it may be interpreted as: 'The clamour is right for Aristoclidas who carries a victory'. With this interpretation, the poet asserts that the victor deserves the ode he is given. Second, this line lends itself to the interpretation: 'The clamour is conspicuous, and the victory carrying Aristoclidas with it'. The assertion that the present ode is 'conspicuous', sounding loud and clear, and widely known, and that the victor celebrated by it, therefore, will be just as 'conspicuous' and widely known, is, of course, congruent with the encomiastic aims of Pindar's poetry, and it provides a parallel to line 64.

Two of Aristoclidas' accomplishments are mentioned in the relative clause in 68-70. The first is that he 'has added this island to the

---

[42] The ὕμνοϲ is the hymn presently sung. τεὸν ... αἷμα looks back to the praise of the Aeacids in 33-64 and the addition ϲέο δ' ἀγών, τὸν ὕμνοϲ ἔβαλεν, too, refers to what has preceded, especially 15-18: the hymn has 'struck' Zeus' Games, since its subject matter is a victory won at the Nemean Games. Thus Carey, *CPh* 86, 1991, 192-200.

[43] Thus also Instone, *Selected Odes*, pp. 165/6.

[44] Thus Bury, p. 61, and Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 160. On Ruck's interpretation (*Hermes* 100, 1972, 156-8) see Carey, *ibid.*, n. 69.

word of glory' (68). The εὐκλεὴς λόγος refers to the praise Aristoclides is given as a result of his victory, specifically to the ode that is presently being sung. He has 'added' Aegina to this praise, since it shares in his glory. Secondly, he has 'added the sacred Thearion of the Pythian to his bright concerns' (69/70). Apparently, Aristoclidas was a member of the council of *thearoi* of Apollo, an institution we know very little about. The phrasing suggests that he was made a member as a result of his victory, since this phrase is so closely connected to the preceding one which formulates a direct effect of his victory.

70-75 *The Four Virtues*

'Test brings to light the full realization of those things (qualities) which make a man more outstanding' (70-1). Some men have qualities, necessary for acquiring the desired reputation, some have not. These qualities are given by birth. If one lacks them, it is useless to try and accomplish things (40-2). But even if one possesses them, merely possessing them is not enough to be admired. One must bring one's qualities to light by submitting oneself to a test. Competing in the Games is one way to do this, the way Aristoclidas has chosen, fighting a war is another, as Peleus (34), Telamon (36-9), and Achilles (59-63) have done. Thus the gnomic passage in lines 70-5 states in the first place that a man's innate quality does not automatically result in his being 'outstanding' among his fellow men. He has to prove that he possesses it by means of πεῖρα. Then the concept of πεῖρα is connected with the three stages of life. If one strives at becoming ἐξοχώτερος among one's fellow men, one must strive at doing so among one's peers, submitting oneself to the test that fits one's age. That is the limitation of mortality. But it can also be seen as an advantage. Each age provides a new opportunity for a man to prove his superiority. Lines 74/5, then state that 'mortal life drives[45] also four virtues'. It is implied that every single age has an ἀρετά that is especially associated with it. The fourth ἀρετά is being identified by the following sentence as φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον (75). In the specific context of the gnomic passage, φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον refers to acknowledging the limitations imposed upon a mortal man by his age, to realising that the possibility of becoming ἔξοχος beyond the

[45] The verb ἐλᾷι evokes associations with a four-horse chariot. Thus we get the picture of the four ἀρεταί, like horses, drawing the chariot of life.

boundaries of one's age is excluded, and that one must therefore submit oneself to a new πεíρα when the time has come. It is one of the limitations of mortality that one grows old and has to prove himself anew every time. That is the reason why we are in need of a fourth virtue. There is something paradoxical in this. That we mortals have an extra, fourth ἀρετά, seems to be a special privilege, but it is in fact a limitation. Or, in other words, man's inferiority is here presented in a positive way, by focusing upon the effect that it results in an extra ἀρετά.

Though these lines refer to three ἀρεταί that are characteristic of a specific age, Pindar does not say that a man has, or should have all three of them consecutively, as his age is progressing, nor does the association of the three ἀρεταί with the three periods of life imply that each of them is to be found exclusively in one period of life. In fact, this point is clearly made by both τῶν οὐκ ἄπεcτι (76) and the main narrative of this ode (43-63). Whereas one of the main points made by the Achilles-story is that qualities, as they are innate, are present already at birth and from that moment form on a constant, unvarying factor, the story also shows that with each period of life there is a new πεíρα, a new opportunity to submit these innate qualities to a test. Achilles proved himself to be an exceptional boy by submitting himself to the test imposed upon him by his perilous playgrounds on Mount Pelion, and as a man he gloriously passed the test consisting in standing his ground on the Trojan battle-fields. But he did both by displaying the same, constant, innate excellence.

The poet himself, too, acts upon the maxim φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον, since he immediately proceeds to perform his encomiastic tasks in their narrowest sense and to praise the victor by applying to him the general remarks on the four ἀρεταί.

τῶν οὐκ ἄπεcτι (76) explicitly ascribes all three of the virtues, as well as φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον to Aristoclidas. If one takes this literally, it means that Aristoclidas did not only have the qualities associated with youth (e.g. courage) and manhood (e.g. strength), both of which he proved to possess by winning the pancration contest in Nemea, but that he also possesses the qualities typical for an older man. This entails that there is a reason to rank him as a παλαίτεροc[46], which can be understood in the light of lines 69/70

[46] Dissen (p. 373) takes it quite literal: "Aristoclides Aegineta ... fuit pancratistes eximius ..., nunc senex factus, quum hoc carmen caneretur. Neque enim statim fecerat Pindarus carmen parta Nemeaea victoria, sed diu post nescio qua causa retardatum misit, quum Aristoclides redeunte ludorum tempore victoriae olim reportatae sollemnia repeteret."

mentioning that he was now made a member of the council of Thearoi, a function that would require such qualities as are commonly associated with elders, such as good counselling and a skilled tongue. Because of his new function, Aristoclidas has entered the realm of the παλαίτεροι. As such, he will have to prove himself anew. And the πεῖρα for this being imposed upon him is his new function as a Thearos of Apollo. Thus the gnomic passage in 70-5 has a direct relevance to the victor, as it presents his public career as an opportunity to submit himself to a new πεῖρα. φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον is then to be understood also as an incitement to accept the new opportunity with open arms. The point made by the Achilles story, that excellence is innate and therefore a constant factor in a man's life, implies the expectation that Aristoclidas will also prove himself to be 'outstanding' in his new function, among his new age peers. Aristoclidas has, if only by his victories, proved that he possesses innate excellence, and this is in itself a reason to take it for granted that he also has the capacities needed in order to prove himself among the elders. The advantage of this interpretation will be clear. The careful construction of the Achilles story, which aims at making clear that Achilles' excellence is a constant factor, unvarying with his age, thus gets a deep significance, in that it implies the same for the victor, and sublimates his athletic successes in high hopes for the new career on which he is about to embark.

76-80 *Dedication. The Poet Sending a Cocktail of Song to the Victor*

Χαῖρε (76). The greeting triggers a fresh start. The original denotation of the verb χαίρειν may shine through. Aristoclidas has good reason indeed to 'be delighted.' First, he possesses the four ἀρεταί, as the preceding clause states; moreover, a magnificent cocktail of song is sent to him, as the following sentence says. 'As a friend I send you this mixture of honey with white[47] milk—mingling dew is dressing it —, a drink of song on the Aeolian breath of pipes,—late though it be' (76-80). The metaphorical description of 'this ode that is now being sung' as a 'mixture of honey with milk and dew' may be said

---

[47] The hyperbaton gives relief to λευκῶι (77) especially since cύν (76) is syntactically superfluous. Moreover, the qualification is pleonastic, to the effect that the 'whiteness' of the milk is emphasized. The effect of this may be that the milk is presented as 'white, i.e. radiant, bright, clear'. Light, as a metaphor of success, glory and fame, is a recurrent image in this ode (δέδορκεν φάος, 84, and ψεφηνός, 41). This suggests that the current ode will contribute to the victor's glory and fame.

to become less conventional with each of the three ingredients that is added. Comparing a song with honey is not unusual. The mixture of honey with milk is conventional from a culinary point of view, but as a metaphor for song it is without parallel[48]. The addition of dew to the mixture is unique even in culinary practice[49]. Moreover, ἐέρϲα (78) is a relatively rare and poetic noun; the elision of the long final vocal is irregular. The metaphorical usage of the verb ἀμφέπει (78) is striking. All this adds to the impression of the song being something very special and extraordinary, a unique and newly invented cocktail of delicious ingredients. The image of the cocktail of song recapitulates διψῆι in line 6; Aristoclidas' victory 'thirsts for' a song, and at the end of this ode the thirst has been quenched by a very exclusive drink. It must be borne in mind that whenever Pindar emphasizes the aesthetic qualities of his products, he is serving an encomiastic purpose. The quality of his odes is the main guarantee for the victor's fame to live on for ever.

ὀψέ περ (80) indicates that, apparently, there had been some delay in the delivery of the ode. One could imagine that some time, more than strictly necessary, has elapsed between the day of Aristoclidas' victory and the performance of this ode, or between the moment that Pindar was commisioned to write this ode and the execution of this task.[50] We cannot determine for what reason the delivery had been delayed, nor for how long, but apparently it took longer than usual, for Pindar apologizes for the delay by explicitly recognizing his shortcoming and by means of the following eagle-passage.

80-84 *The Image of the Eagle. The Victor's Previous Successes*

'The eagle is swift among winged creatures, (the eagle) who suddenly seizes, with a long sweep from afar, his bloody prey with his talons. The chattering jackdaws live low. For you, if the bright-throned Clio is willing, because of your victorious spirit, from Nemea and from Epidaurus and Megara the light is shining' (80-84). The poet makes statements about birds, which have, on a literal level, nothing to do with the context in which they are made. Pindar

---

[48] Pindar calls his song a 'mixed drink' also in the opening lines of *I.*6, without, however, specifying the ingredients.

[49] Ordinary water (instead of dew) is a normal ingredient, cf. e.g. τῆϲ δὲ νυκτὸϲ γάλα βοὸϲ καὶ μέλι καὶ ὕδωρ πινέτω, Hp.*Nat.Mul.*47.8, etc.

[50] Thus it is taken by the scholia (ὡϲ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον τῆϲ νίκηϲ γεγραμμένου τοῦ ποιήματοϲ, 138a, III 61 Dr.; ὅλωϲ ὀψέ {φηϲί} γέγραπταί μοι τὸ ποίημα, 138b, III 61 Dr.) and by most of the modern critics (e.g. Christ *ad loc.* [p. 257]: "sero quidem carmen mittitur").

does not provide any explicit signals that unambiguously relate the image to a specific notion in the context. In accordance with the 'co-operative principle,' as described by H.P. Grice,[51] the hearer assumes that the statement about the eagle is meant by the poet to be a statement about something else, and searches for possibilities of identifying the eagle with some other notion, in order to arrive at an interpretation of the statement which does make sense in the context. The preceding passage about the poet sending a cocktail of song (76-80) and the association between ὀψέ περ and ὠκύς (80) are reasons to apply the image of the eagle to the poet[52]. He is late, but he is fast; coming from afar he catches his prey[53]. Pindar uses this association as an excuse for the delay, an excuse which, on closer consideration, does not hold. However fast he may be, the delay cannot be made up for. But then, by means of a shift in the imagery, by concentrating on the eagle's superiority over other birds, Pindar does give an excuse which is valid. The κραγέται κολοιοί must be interpreted as Pindar's rivals and Bernadini (*QUCC* 26, 1977, p. 124) rightly observes that the image, thus interpreted, visualizes the excellence of Pindar's poem, and that this can be regarded as a satisfactory compensation for the delay[54].

The last two verses (83/4) of this ode, however, argue for applying the image to the victor as well. The particles γε μέν in 83 point in this direction. The victor (τίν, 83) has achieved success and fame, and the particles stress the contrast with those who have not. μέν is a signal indicating that something will follow, often a clause with a corresponding δέ. The normal procedure is that the *topic* referred to in the marked position before μέν is opposed to another *topic* men-

---

[51] 'Logic and Conversation', *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (P. Cole & J.L. Morgan, edd.), New York 1975, 41-58.

[52] Bernadini (p. 124): "il contrasto tra ὀψέ περ e ὠκύς, che evidenzia indiscutibilmente la relazione tra la velocità del volo e il ritardo del poeta".

[53] Just as the poet elsewhere hopes to 'hit the target like an arrow' (*N.*6.26-8). I do not believe Mary Lefkowitz' suggestion that "Pindar concentrates on describing what it feels like to seize control from his competitors at the moment of victory" (*First-Person Fictions*, p. 163). Pindar does indeed imply a contrast between himself and his rivals by contrasting the eagle to the κραγέται κολοιοί, but these are not the same as his δαφοινὸν ἄγραν. The point of similarity is, as in the case of the arrow simile, that Pindar claims to find exactly the right words. Cf. also what Aristotle tells us about the eagle: λαμβάνει δὲ μεγα, ὅταν λαβῆι, *H.A.* 619b29/30.

[54] Stoneman (*CQ* N.S. 26, 1976, p. 194) tries to eliminate this possibility by stating that "there is no need to assume a connection of thought at all" between 76-80 and 80-4. Apart from the fact that an interpretation that does explain connections in thought is, to my mind, preferable to one that does not, the semantic relation between ὀψέ περ and ὠκύς is too close to be ignored.

tioned in the position before the corresponding δέ. γε is restrictive; it is a signal indicating that the statement made in 83/4 applies to the person referred to by τίν and to no one else. Here the *topic* opposed to τίν is not expressed, so the contrast is left implicit. As the passage about the eagle contains a similar contrast, the hearer is invited to apply the image of the eagle to the victor and to identify the chattering jackdaws with those for whom the light does not shine. Moreover, the image of an eagle catching his pray is in itself suggestive of a victor in the pancration.

So the context immediately preceding the image leads the hearer to apply the image of the eagle to the poet, and, consequently, to apply the image of the chattering jackdaws to his rivals; but once the audience hears 83/4 it is prompted to re-evaluate the equation and decide that the image of the eagle applies also to the victor, the inferior birds then referring to his opponents.[55]

Thanks to Clio, Aristoclidas earns glory and fame. The willingness of Clio is not the cause of Aristoclidas' victories,[56] but the condition for his fame. δέδορκεν φάος refers to the victor's fame and glory. Clio is one of the Muses. Muses do not play any part in the distribution of the prizes at the Games. It is their province to celebrate the victory. They are responsible for the victor's fame to spread far and wide by means of the medium of poetry. Victories need to be celebrated by an ode in order effect glory for the victor. It is implied that the 'light is shining' for Aristoclidas because of Clio, who manifests herself in this ode. The association of Κλειώ with κλέος is close at hand[57], and may be the reason for Pindar to choose this Muse. Clio may be the particular Muse intended in line opening lines of this ode, but, if so, the hearer realizes this only here.

Finally the victor's earlier victories are recorded. Apart from his Nemean victory, the one that is presently being celebrated, he has, on earlier occasions, also won in Epidaurus and in Megara.

---

[55] Both G.A. Privitera, 'Eracle e gli Eacidi nella terza «Nemea»', *GIF* n.s. 8 [29](1977), pp. 268/9, and Hubbard (*Pindaric Mind*, pp. 150/1) conclude that the eagle in this passage represents the poet as well as the victor, but both fail to appreciate this precise procedure. It is only in retrospect that the listener realizes the double relevance of the image. For the image of the eagle in *N*.5.21 see my note *ad loc.* For a general discussion of all passages in which the eagle image occurs (apart from *N*.5 and *h.l.*, esp. *O*.2.86-8 and B.5.16-30; also *I*.4.45-8 and *P*.5.107-15) see my 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89, 1994, 305-17.

[56] Thus Farnell (p. 255): "the victories of Aristokleidas are regarded as due to her dispensation or her will".

[57] See West on Hes.*Th*.77-9 (pp. 180/1); P. Friedländer, *GGA* 1931, 235; Snell, *Entdeckung*, pp. 66/7; Maehler on B.13.1-12 (II, pp. 258/9).

The Relevance of the Heracles Myth

What is the relevance of the 'digression' about Heracles? Ancient commentators took Pindar's presentation seriously, as if he suddenly realizes that he is digressing and therefore drops the myth.[58] This interpretation fails to appreciate the fictional nature of the break-off (see Introduction, pp. 34-7).[59] Bundy (II, p. 44, with n. 11) gives the following characteristic analysis: "the topic (lines 19 f. οὐκέτι – εὐμαρέϲ), introduced to enhance the glory of Aristokleidas, is made to assume digressive proportions ... in order that it may again serve as foil for the introduction of the Aiakidai." This interpretation was accepted by Erbse (*Hermes* 97, 1969, 278/9) and Ruck (*Hermes* 100, 1972, 156). Carey quite rightly objects: "Thus for accidental irrelevance, the spontaneous outpourings of the garrulous poet who inhabited the odes before Bundy's monograph appeared, we are given contrived irrelevance. But the irrelevance is still there, and this section when treated as preparatory foil without thematic significance contributes little to the avowed aim of the poem, which is to praise Aristoclides" (*Eranos* 78, 1980, 155). The relevance of the Heracles story is manifold. Heracles' physical qualities are by no means out of place in an ode for a pancration victor. Moreover, he was the founder of the Nemean games. On a very basic level this accounts for his presence here.[60]

Carey explains the relevance of the Heracles myth as follows: "The break-off in *N.*3 does ... emphasize the close geographical relevance of the following Aeacid myths to the victor, and therefore underline the connection between his achievements and the mythical glories of Aegina" (p. 156); and "The Heracles-myth is carefully distinguished from the following Aeginetan myths by the break-off

---

[58] Cf., e.g., ἀποϲτρέφει τὸν λόγον πρὸϲ ἑαυτόν· ᾔϲθετο γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ παρεκβάντοϲ, Σ. 45c, III, 49 Dr.

[59] Although Instone, *Selected Odes*, p. 158, is fully aware of the fact that the break-off "is not to be taken literally as implying that he [Pindar] has made a mistake in his narrative," he surprisingly seems to regard the break-off as preventing a mistake which Pindar was at risk of making: "he [Heracles] was a hero who because of the magnitude of his achievements became a god, whereas a victor in the games can never escape his mortality. Therefore Pindar is *right* to break off the narrative and prevent the emergence of too sustained a comparison between the victor and Heracles; and the break-off also enables him to return to the theme of Aegina, which the Heracles myth was threatening to push out of sight" (my italics). Whereas the ancient commentators take the break-off as a genuine correction of a real *faux pas* and as a signal that the preceding narrative is to be discarded as irrelevant, Instone seems to regard it as a genuine prevention of a real *faux pas* and as a signal for limited relevance.

[60] Cf. Instone, *Selected Odes*, p. 158.

which intervenes. It is however closely linked, both syntactically and in theme, with the preceding praise of the victor" (pp. 156/7). This leads him to interpret the Heracles myth as a substitute of direct praise: "the myth is an elaboration of οὐ μαλαχθείς (15 f.)" (p. 157), emphasizing the victor's ability to endure labour through to the finish.[61] Carey is certainly right in arguing that the Heracles story constitutes a complimentary parallel to the victor's achievement; but, if the Heracles-myth is meant to illustrate the endurance of labour, why has Pindar chosen exactly Heracles' voyage to Cádiz? Surely Heracles' legend has labours that are much more suggestive of endurance than that.

The main point in the Heracles story is the association of Aristoclidas' victory with the voyage of Heracles to the point beyond which no man can go. This idea is also touched upon in the lines leading up to the Heracles myth: 'If Aristophanes' son, being beautiful and doing what fits his bodily form, has reached the peak of masculinity, yet to travel further is not easy over the untrodden sea beyond the Pillars of Heracles' (19-21). The εἰ sentence as a whole is traditionally interpreted as a warning to the victor. Now, admittedly, there are quite a few examples in Pindar of a protasis formulating a condition of extreme happiness, followed by an apodosis with the *ne plus ultra* theme. But here the conditional clause differs from Pindar's normal practice in that the subject is not an indefinite τις, as in all the comparable passages, but the victor, mentioned by name. The effect of this is that, instead of the usual implicit suggestion that the victor should be careful with further ambitions, we have it explicitly stated here that with his recent victory the victor has reached his limit. The superlative phrase ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα (20) helps to convey that the peak has been reached; and this is the point of the Heracles-story precisely. It is striking that Pindar all but explicitly says that the victor has reached his limit and that he cannot go any further, especially since this is a victor who has just won his first victory in one of the Great Games, in Nemea, the least prestigious in the hierarchy of the four great festivals, and whose palmares for minor festivals have so far been modest.[62] If these lines are just

[61] "In *N.*3 the Heracles-myth deals only with endurance, while the Aeacid myths enable Pindar to combine this element with an exposition of inherited *arete*", Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 162.

[62] Thus Instone, *Selected Odes*, on line 84: "He has done well, but not outstandingly so, his victories being few and without ones at either the Pythian or (best of all) the Olympic Games. He is, perhaps, equivalent in status to a European Games winner" (p. 169).

meant to warn the victor not to let the victory go to his head, the poet has chosen a remarkably tactless way to put it. The only situation in which the suggestion, that Aristoclidas has reached his limit, would not be out of place would be the situation in which Aristoclidas in fact did put an end to his athletic career. If I am right in deducing from the (in such occurrences of the 'πόνοϲ motif' unconventional)[63] medical terminology in lines 17/8 that Aristoclidas was severely injured during competition, the collocation of this reference with the *ne plus ultra* passage leading into the Heracles story may be taken to reflect the situation that the victor was forced to put an end to his fighting career because of his injuries.

Admittedly, this is an hypothesis for which we will never be able to adduce independent evidence. But this hypothetical reconstruction of the circumstances of the victory has the advantage of shedding much light on the relevance of the Heracles passage, as well as of some other aspects of this ode. The hypothesis does not only explain why Pindar has chosen to relate Aristoclidas' victory to the story of Heracles reaching the point beyond which no man can go, it also makes us aware of the tactful compliment that this association involves. It re-assesses Aristoclidas' deplorable misfortune of not being able to prolong his athletic career in terms of a highly commendable perseverance in trying to reach the ultimate limit, so as to be comparable, of all things, to Heracles' glorious voyage to the end of the world. It has been observed before that κατέβαινε ... τέλοϲ in line 25, said of Heracles, is taken up by the ψεφηνὸϲ ἀνήρ, who οὔ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ | κατέβα ποδί, with his ἀτελεῖ νόωι (41/2)[64]. If the verbal repetitions are made productive to the interpretation, it is not only suggested that Heracles is an example of a man having ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία—which is obvious for a son of Zeus—, but also that the success of a man with ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία has a lot to do with reaching the τέλοϲ. The voyage of Heracles illustrating this idea suggests that reaching one's τέλοϲ does not only mean realising the aims one has set out for oneself, but also going as far as one can possibly go. This is a very appropriate and tactful thing to suggest, if Aristoclidas was so severely wounded that he had to put an end to his athletic career, since it involves the suggestion that Aristoclidas' mischance represents the mentality typical for a man with ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία, in that he went as far as he could possibly go.

---

[63] For the alleged tension between conventional motifs and historical allusions see further introduction, pp. 4-6.

[64] Thus Bury, II 40; Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 41.

The hypothesis has the additional advantage of making the political dimension to Aristoclidas' victory easier to understand. His new public function of Pythian Thearos is presented in this ode as a result of his athletic victory: this is suggested by the syntax in 68-70 and by lines 14-7, where he is said, surprisingly, to have enhanced the *agora* by means of his victory. Whether Aristoclidas was in fact given his honourable public function as some sort of compensation for the end of his athletic career, we have no means of knowing. But there can be little doubt that Pindar presents it as such. That Aristoclidas' victory involved a transition from an athletic to a public career gives the gnomic passage about the four virtues in 70-5 far deeper significance. As we have observed above, this passage has direct relevance to the victor, who has entered the realm of the παλαίτεροι to the extent that his new function will require ἀρεταί associated with παλαίτεροι. If one combines this with the statement in 19-21 that he has 'set foot upon the highest ἀνορέαι' and that he cannot go any further on this path, one gets the strong impression that Aristoclidas is presented as definitively having left the stage of being an ἀνήρ behind, having reached the highest of what a man can reach and having displayed the maximum of the qualities characteristic for that stage of life (ἀνορέαι); and that he has now transgressed to the stage of the παλαίτεροι, in which he gets a new opportunity to prove himself, a new πεῖρα, as a Thearos of Apollo. Thus the gnomic passage in 70-5 also has a consoling touch, as it describes his transition from the category of men to the elders as a new opportunity to submit himself to the πεῖρα in order to prove 'outstanding' among elders. φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον is then to be understood also as an incitement not to mourn over lost capacities but to accept the new opportunity enthousiastically.

There is a parallel between Heracles and Achilles: both traveled to the end of the world, Heracles literally so, in reaching the point in the west beyond which no man may sail, Achilles in the opposite direction, to the Ethiopians, who were the ἔσχατοι ἄνδρες, although he did not go there in person, only his reputation reached those areas[65]. In fact, both 'journeys' mirror one another. Heracles 'made known the earth', while Achilles made himself known to the limits of the known earth. Heracles defined the world in order to allow the Aeacids to fill it with their fame. The implicit references to Heracles in the Telamon story (36-9) have the same function. They illustrate the principle of an Aeacid gaining

[65] Cf. Froidefond, *Lire Pindare*, p. 8.

fame and glory in co-operation with Heracles.[66] The idea of Heracles creating the conditions for Aeginetans to flourish also holds true for the victor himself: he won at Games founded by Heracles. Along the same lines, it cannot be a coincidence that in an ode for an Aeginetan victor Pindar relates the (in itself not particularly familiar) story about Heracles making the seas navigable. Aegina owed all of its wealth and prestige to its nautical superiority. So of all Heracles' accomplishments his cleansing of the sea is of special relevance, not to say of paramount importance, to Aegina,—especially to the ruling elite of 'ship-owners', of which Aristoclidas was a member[67]. So Heracles cleared the ways for Aegina to make use of them.

On a basic level, the idea that Heracles created the conditions for Aegina to prosper suggests that Aegina enjoyed the cooperation of the most glorious of all heroes. In fact, this explains why Heracles is emphatically characterised as a ἥρωϲ θεόϲ (22): the hero with whom Aegina has a special bond is not just a hero who is a dime a dozen, but the one and only hero with divine stature[68]. On a more complex level this idea gets even more pregnancy. Although it perhaps goes too far to say that Heracles 'stands for' Aristoclidas, it is clear that the victor is closely associated with the hero. Heracles' voyage to the end of the world mirrors Aristoclidas' perseverance in prolonging his athletic career to the point beyond which he cannot go any further.[69] The audience are invited to apply the parallel between the victor and Heracles to the idea of Aegina flourishing because of Heracles, which suggests that Aegina flourishes because of Aristoclidas' victory, as it is explicitly said in line 69 (τάνδε νᾶϲον εὐκλέϊ προϲέθηκε λόγωι) and implied by χώραϲ ἄγαλμα in 13.

The Role of Chiron

It is quite remarkable that Chiron plays such a prominent role within the context of the Achilles story. Moreover, there is, at first sight, something contradictory in the fact that his accomplishments as an

---

[66] I do not believe that Telamon's company contrasts the "unsocialized figure" Peleus and is "meant to represent a higher stage of social organization", as Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 40, suggested.

[67] Thus Privitera, *GIF* n.s. 8, 1977, 249-273, esp. p. 252. Cf. also the reference to ξενία in line 2.

[68] Carey (*Eranos* 78, 1980, 155, n. 51) suggested that the phrase ἥρωϲ θεόϲ "by stressing Heracles' stature confirms that the limits he set are valid for all lesser men". This is true, of course, but there must be more to it.

[69] Cf. Instone, *Selected Odes*, p. 158: "both reached their glorious goals and then sailed home."

educator are elaborated upon, while the gnomic passage in 40-2 seems to entail an explicit rejection of 'learned things'. However, as Carey has argued, "Chiron reared Achilles, and increased his martial spirit (θυμὸν αὔξων) with training. Here we see the impact of teaching on φυά. Mere learning itself is futile, but when added to innate qualities it becomes a potent force. The account of Chiron's training reinforces the contrast between the man with συγγενὴς εὐδοξία and the failure, the man with mere learning in 41 ff." (*Eranos* 78, 1980, p. 159).[70]

Carey's observation that Chiron's education resembles "training"[71] deserves closer attention. In fact, Achilles' most famous accomplishments at Troy are presented as the goal of Chiron's training. There is another point: νύμφευσε δ' αὖτις ἀγλαόκολπον | Νηρέος θύγατρα, 56/7, recalls καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν | ἐγκονητί, 35/6. Both statements are in corresponding lines (6/7 of the antistrophe), dealing with the same event. Moreover, as we have observed above, in 35/6 Chiron is present in the minds of the audience because of the preceding reference to the spear he had cut. The double reference to one and the same event has troubled many interpretors. Some have suggested that Pindar simply relates two different versions of the myth without bothering to square them with one another[72]. Others have then exonerated Pindar from the charge of being inconsistent, by rightly pointing out that Chiron's assistance does not exclude the possibility of Peleus doing the actual subjection alone[73]. But what is the *function* of relating the same event twice, in one ode, from a different perspective? ἐγκονητί (36) evokes associations with combat sports, to the effect that Peleus' subjection of Thetis is described as if it were a wrestling match. Chiron's assistance in this

---

[70] Thus also Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, 287 n. 2; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 42.

[71] Gianotti (*Atti dell' Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 109, 1955, 55/6) and Hubbard (*Pindaric Mind*, 42, with n. 89) suggested that Chiron's μῆτις also suggests a parallel between him and the poet. However, the context prevents us from making this association productive. Whereas an epinicion poet comes in after the battle is lost and won, in order to make sure that fame will live on, the point made about Chiron here is that he takes care of the right mental disposition of his pupil *before* he exposes himself to the perils of battle.

[72] Thus Des Places, p. 56. Cf. Bowra, *Pindar*, 286.

[73] "Die Formulierung in N. 3, 56 bezieht sich wohl vor allem auf die berühmte, von Chiron ausgerichtete Hochzeitsfeier (vg. Boeckh im Kommentar z. St. [S. 373]: »Nam ut caperet Thetidem, monuerat Peleum et apud se in antro celebratas viderat nuptias«). Den eigentliche Kampf mußte Peleus auf jeden Fall allein bestehen. Es liegt also kein Grund vor, die Verse N. 3, 56-57 bzw. Isthm. 8, 41-45 und N. 3, 35 bzw. N. 4, 60-65 verschiedenen Versionen zuzuordnen und den Dichter der Unaufmerksamkeit oder gar der Ungeschicklichkeit zu bezichtigen.", Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 281.

event is thus portrayed as if it were assistance in a wrestling match. This clearly associates the role played by Chiron in the event with the activities of a trainer. But why?

Aristoclidas did not have a trainer. He owed his successes completely to himself, just as the heroes in this ode accomplish great deeds without the help of others. In the light of these circumstances it is even more surprising that the poet, by means of Chiron, emphasizes the advantages of training.[74] If one is prepared to acknowledge a further consequence of the hypothesis that Aristoclidas had to put an end to his athletic career, Chiron's portrayal as a trainer may be taken to imply the hope or expectation that Aristoclidas may one day exploit his fighting experience and become a trainer. This implied hope explains much of the major paradox in this ode. Throughout this ode heroes do things alone, without the help of others, thus acquiring fame and glory; but all the same Chiron is credited with similar glory because of his assistance to some of these heroes. With the line of interpretation I propose, this mirrors Aristoclidas' paradoxical situation exactly. He himself won his victory without the assistance of a trainer, which adds considerably to his glory, but now he has the opportunity to share in the glory of victors to come by becoming their trainer. The climax of all the recorded accomplishments by the Aeacids is Achilles standing face to face with hosts of fierce enemies (60/1) and especially his slaying of Memnon (61-3). This resulted in the 'far-shining light of the Aeacids' being 'firmly fixed' (64). The fact that these accomplishments are presented as being the aim of Chiron's training cannot be understood unless it is taken as implying that Aristoclidas may as a trainer contribute to just as great, or even greater successes than the ones he enjoyed as an athlete; and that he may thus contribute just as much, or even more to Aegina's fame as a trainer than he has as an athlete. There is in fact one signal in line 63 that can be taken to serve as an indication that Achilles' slaying of Memnon has relevance to the victor's future: that Memnon is said to be related to a famous seer (ἀνεψιὸϲ ... Ἑλένοιο) is completely irrelevant in the context unless it is assumed that it is a device for evoking associations with the notion of future.[75]

---

[74] It is therefore quite unlikely that "le *laudandus* a été mis en position d'élève", as Froidefond explains Chiron's role (*Lire Pindare*, 9).

[75] The reference to Helenus has, in fact, troubled many commentators. "Dann aber einen aus der Schar der Priamiden herauszugreifen, der mit Memnon gar nichts besonderes zu tun hat, ist wirklich ein κακόζηλον und schmeckt nach Lykophron", Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, 280, n. 2. Thus also Farnell. Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 283, n. 2, at least bothers to *explain* it: "Zweifellos aber möchte Pindar

Finally, if Heracles is meant to parallel the victor, the implicit reference to Heracles in the Telamon-story, too, suggests that Aegina flourishes in co-operation with Aristoclidas. More specifically: Heracles' voyage to the end of the world mirrors Aristoclidas' perseverance in prolonging his athletic career to the end. Heracles turned back and then accompanied Telamon on expeditions which greatly contributed to Telamon's fame and glory. The suggestion is that Aristoclidas too, after having returned from his final tournament, will accompany Aeginetans on future 'expeditions' to the Great Games, and that he will thus, as a trainer, contribute to their and Aegina's fame and glory.[76]

---

andeuten, daß Achills Siegeszug die letzten Hoffnungen der Troer zerschlug. Diesen Erfolg hatte nicht einmal deren bester Seher geahnt oder wahrhaben wollen. Helenos ist also mit bedacht genannt."

[76] One could attempt to link the reference to Asclepius with the image of victory being a 'healing remedy' in line 18. The verbal repetition μαλακόχειρα (55) ~ μαλαχθεὶς (16) may be an additional argument to make this attempt. See also Gianotti, *Atti Torino* 109, 1975, 56; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 43. This would associate Asclepius with victory. That Chiron has taught the power to heal to Asclepius would then imply that he has taught skills that have the same effect that victory has, that the results of Chiron's education are associated with victory. And that is exactly what a trainer does. Though this is perhaps too far-fetched, it fits in the picture.

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Proem (future reference)

1-14(a) Prooemion. Invocation of the Muse
  1-3(a) Entreaty to the Muse to come to Aegina [address with ὦ]
  3(b)-8 Motivation [γάρ]
    3(b)-5 Motivation of the entreaty
    6-8 Why a song is needed [δέ]
      6 'foil'
      7-8 specific case in point [δέ]
  9 Entreaty to the Muse to supply the song [τᾶς, address]
  10-11(a) Muse is asked to begin [δ']
  11(b)-12(a) The poet's own role [δέ]
  12(b)-14(a) What kind of song it will be [δ']
    12(b)-13(a) What kind of labour the song entails
    13(b)-14(a) Statement about the past of Aegina [ἵνα]

Current Occasion (present reference)

14(b)-21 Direct praise of the victor
  14(b)-17(a) Name of the victor, place of the festival, discipline [ὧν]
  17(b)-18 Victory heals wounds [δέ]
  19-21 Victor has achieved the highest possible glory [εἰ δ']
    19-20(a) Protasis, formulating the victor's glory
    20(b)-21 Apodosis, stating that it is not easy to go any further from there, formulated in terms of the Pillars of Heracles

First Narrative (past reference)

22-26(a) Heracles
  22-23(a) Factual statement about Heracles having set up the Pillars [ἅϲ]
  23(b)-25 Previous history of this [δέ]
    23(b)-24(a) Heracles subdued the monsters of the sea
    24(b)-25(a) He found his way [τ']
      25(b) and reached his goal [ὁπᾶι]
  26(a) Consequence of this [καί]

Break-Off. Back to the Current Occasion (present reference)

26(b)-32(a) Break-off. Transition from Heracles to the Aeacids
  26(b)-27 'What are you doing?' The poet is led astray [asyndeton]
  28 Self-exhortation, the right thing to do. Deal with Aeacids [asyndeton]
  29-30 Motivation of this in gnomic terms [δέ]
    29 It is always right to praise a good man
    30 but this should be an innate hero [οὐδ']
  31(a) Self-exhortation: deal with Aeacids [asyndeton]
  31(b)-32(a) This is a sensible thing to do. There is plenty material [δ']

Second Narrative (past reference)
32(b)-39 Aeacids (I): Peleus and Telamon
  32(b)-36(a) Peleus [δ']
  36(b)-39 Telamon [δ']
40-42 Gnomic interruption
  40 Inborn glory enables one to achieve things [δέ]
  41-42 'learned things' do not [δέ]
43-63 Aeacids (II): Achilles
  43-52(a) Achilles' childhood [δ' ... τὰ μέν]
    43-44(a) Summary info
    44(b)-49 Achilles' great deeds as a boy [asyndeton]
      44(b)-48 Narrative of his deeds proper
      49 Temporal specification [τὸ πρῶτον ... δ' ἔπειτ']
    50-52(a) Achilles' deeds as a boy from a new point of view [τόν]
  52(b)-53(a) Poet intrudes [δέ]
  53(b)-63 Chiron as an educator [asyndeton]
    53(b)-58 'Catalogue' of Chiron's accomplishments
      53(b)-55 Education of Jason and Asclepius
        53(b)-54(a) Jason
        54(b)-55 Asclepius [καὶ ἔπειτεν]
      56-58 Thetis' marriage and Achilleus' education [δ' αὖτις]
        59-63 Achilles' manhood (goal of education) [ὄφρα]
64 Evaluation. Relevance of the related past for the present [asyndeton]

Back to the Current Occasion (present reference)
65-66 Invocation of Zeus
  65(a) Invocation of Zeus [asyndeton]
  65(b) First motivation [γάρ]
  65(c)-66 Second motivation [δ']
67-84 Direct praise of the victor
  67 Song is fitting to the victor [δέ]
  68-70(a) Motivation of this [ὅς]
  70(b)-75 Gnomic interruption [δέ]
    70(b)-74(a) 'Testing', comparing oneself to one's peers
    74(b)-75 Four virtues [δὲ καί]
  76(a) Application of the gnomic principles to the victor [τῶν]
  76(b) Greeting, triggering fresh beginning [asyndeton]
  76(c)-80(a) Poet sends a cocktail of song, though late [asyndeton]
  80(b)-82 Image of the eagle [δ']
    80(b)-81 Superior eagle
    82 Inferior jackdaws [δ']
  83-84 Direct praise of the victor. His earlier victories [γε μέν]

METRICAL ANALYSIS

Strophe/Antistrophe

1	— — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⁞ — ⁞⏑⏑ — ⁞ — ⏑ — ‖	× — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — — ⏑ — ‖	×dssd'sǁ
2	— ⏑ — ⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⁞⏑⏑ — ‖	— ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑⏑ — ‖	sss˜ss'˜sǁ *vel* ss'˜dss˜–ǁ *vel* ssd˜'s'˜sǁ *vel* ssd˜'ss˜–ǁ
3	⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞ — — ⏑⁞⏑⁞⏑⏑ — ‖	⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — — ⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ‖	˜sds's˜sǁ *vel* ˜sds'd˜–ǁ
4	⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞ — — ⏑ — ⁞⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⁞ — ⁞⏑ — ‖	⏑ — ⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — — ⏑ — ‖	‸ss'sds'sǁ
5	— — ⁞⏑ — ⏑⁞ — ⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ‖	× — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ‖	×sss˜sdǁ *vel* ×ssd˜'dǁ *vel* ×ss'˜ddǁ
6	— — ⁞⏑⁞ — ⏒ — ⁞⏑⁞⏑⁞ — — ‖	× — ⏑ — × — ⏑⏑ — — ‖	×s×d–ǁ
7	— ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⁞⏑ — ⏑ — ⁞ — ⁞⏑ — ‖	— ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — — ⏑ — ‖	ssds'sǁ
8	⏑⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞⏑⁞ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞ — — ‖‖	⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — — ‖‖	‸ddssss–‖‖ *vel* ×dssss–‖‖

Epode

1	— ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏒ — ⏑ — — ‖	— ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — × — ⏑ — — ‖	dsd×s–ǁ *vel* dsds̄s–ǁ
2	⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑⁞ — ⏑⏑⁞⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁞ ⏑ — ⏑ — — ⁞⏑ — ‖	⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — — ⏑ — ‖	‸s˜sss˜sdss'sǁ *vel* ‸s˜ss'˜ddss'sǁ *vel* ˜dss˜sdss'sǁ *vel* ˜ds'˜ddss'sǁ *vel* ‸d˜'ss˜sdss'sǁ *vel* ‸d˜'s'˜ddss'sǁ
3	— ⏑ — ⏑⁞⏑⁞ — — ⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞⏑⁞ — — ‖	— ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — — ‖	sd'sd–ǁ
4	— ⏑⏑ — ⁞⏑⁞ — ⁞⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁞ — ⁞⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁞ — ⏑ ⏓ ⏑ — ‖	— ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — — ⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁞ — ⏑ — ⏑ — ‖	dssd'sd'ssǁ
5	⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⁞ ⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⁞⏑ — — ⏑ — ‖‖	⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — ⁞ ⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑ — — ⏑ — ‖‖	‸ddsdds's‖‖ *vel* ×ds×ds's‖‖

Remarks

The ode has four triads. All verses are heterogenous (excepting str. 2, which allows for the interpretation sss˘˘ss'˘˘s‖). There is variation of juxtaposition and prolongation. The traditional characterization of odes of this type as 'aeolic' is not infelicitous in this case, as Pindar himself thus characterizes the musical features of this ode in line 79 (see my note *ad loc.*). *Nemean* III differs from other 'aeolic' odes of Pindar in that ancipitia are relatively rare, especially in the course of a verse and that it is unnecessary here to assume occurrences of more than one anceps in a row.

Str. 1 has a *Wechselschnitt*, which has, however, not been realized in line 72. There is a preferred word end before the three final syllables, lines 9 and 72 being the exceptions.

Str. 2 has a *Wechselschnitt* in the middle and a preferred word end at the end of the line. It is remarkable that word end has consequently been realized before the four short syllables in the beginning of the ode (2, 10, 23), and consequently one syllable later henceforth (32, 44, 52, 65, 73). Word end before the three final syllables occurs six times (the exceptions are 2 and 23). Word end does not occur between the three final syllables, nor after the seventh.

Str. 3 has two *Wechselschnitt*s. In the first and third triad and in line 74 word end occurs after the eighth syllable; in the second triad after the seventh. The exception is line 66, which has word end after the ninth. No word end occurs between the three final syllables.

Str. 4 has a *Wechselschnitt* in the beginning and at the end of the verse. The latter has not been realized in line 54, where a proper name occurs, and in line 75. Word end after the seventh syllable has consequently been realized except in line 46, where it occurs after the sixth. No word end occurs between the fourth and the fifth, nor between the eighth and the ninth, nor between the ninth and the tenth syllable. Line 4 is the only example of word end occurring after the twelfth syllable; line 46 is the only example of word end occurring after the sixth syllable.

Str. 5 has a word end after the fifth syllable, except for line 5, where it occurs after the sixth, and line 55, where it occurs after the fourth and the seventh. Word end after the second syllable has consequently been realized in the beginning of the ode (5, 13, 26, [34], 47); it has not been realized in 55 and 68 (76 is a case of doubt). No word end occurs after the third syllable. Line 55 is the

only instance of word end occurring after the fourth syllable. The second half of str. 5 has not been structured by means of preferred word ends; they occur with about equal frequency in every position.

Str. 6 has two *Wechselschnitts*. The one in the beginning of the verse has not been realized only in line 6. For the one in the second half of the verse there are three possible positions for word end to occur; it has not been realized in line 56, unless one interprets ἀγλαό-κολπον. Line 56 is also the only example of word end occurring after the (short) anceps. See below. The fifth syllable is long only in line 48. For the textual difficulty in line 14 see my note *ad loc.*

Str. 7 has a *Wechselschnitt* at the end of the verse (line 36 being the only exception). The word end after the sixth syllable occurs five times (exceptions are 36, 70 [both proper names], and 78). Word end does not occur between the three first or the two final syllables, nor between the fifth and the sixth.

Str. 8 has two *Wechselschnitts*. Word end occurs without exception in one of the three preferred positions in the first half of the verse, and in one of the two preferred positions in the second half.

Ep. 1 has a long anceps only in line 59. Word end occurs freely in every position (excepting the very first and the very last).

Ep. 2 has been articulated quite strictly. It has four preferred positions for word end to occur. Word end after the sixth syllable has not been realized only in line 60 (proper name). Word end after the ninth syllable occurs everywhere but in line 18. Word end after the fifteenth syllable has not been realized only in line 60 (proper name). Word end directly before the two final syllables does not occur in line 60 (proper name). Ep. 2 has no less than nine positions where word end does not occur (including the very first and the very last). Disregarding line 60, which is exceptional if only because of it containing three proper names, results in even three more bridges (⏑⁀⏑ ⏑⁀⏑ —⁀⏑ ⁞ —⁀⏑⁀⏑ ⁞ ⏑⁀⏑ — ⏑⁀⏑⁀— ⁞ ⏑⁀—⁀⏑ —⁀— ⁞ ⏑⁀— ‖).

Ep. 3 has a *Wechselschnitt* in the first half of the verse. Word end occurs in one of the three preferred positions in the second half. Ep. 3 has four positions (including the very last) where word end does not occur.

Ep. 4 ends with ... ⁞ —⁀⏑ — ⏑ — ‖ in the first two triads, and with ... ⁞ —⁀⏑⏑⏑⏑ — ‖ in the last two. It is remarkable that word end occurs within the resolved *longum* in both cases. Ep. 4 has a fixed word end after the seventeenth syllable, and a *Wechselschnitt* in the middle. Word end occurs at one of the three preferred positions in the first half of the verse. There are two bridges.

Ep. 5 has a fixed word end after the eighth syllable[1], and a preferred word end after the fourteenth (the only exception being line 63, where two proper names occur). Word end does not occur in the three syllables preceding the fixed word end, nor between both following it; nor does it occur in the three syllables preceding the preferred word end.

Interpretation

Str. 1. introduces the sequence dssd, which is the 'mother theme' of this ode. The rhythmical pattern of the entire ode is to a high degree determined by variations upon four shortened manifestations of this sequence (dss/ds, and ssd/sd). The blunt ending with juxtaposed s reoccurs several times; it is marked here by the word end directly preceding it (except in lines 9 and 72).

Str. 2 introduces sequences of four and of three short syllables in a row. This results in ambiguity; the verse can be interpreted as (1) ss⏑⏑ss'⏑⏑s‖, as (2) ssd⏑⏑'s'⏑⏑s‖, as (3) ssd⏑⏑'ss⏑⏑–‖, or as (4) ss'⏑⏑dss⏑⏑–‖. All these possibilities are relevant: with (4) the sequence dss from str. 1 is repeated with resolution; with (2) and (3) the sequence ssd is repeated from str. 1 with resolution, while both in a different way echo also the sequence dss; with (1) the ss-element is promoted into an independant theme. Str. 2 begins falling, whereas both the *Wechselschnitt* and the frequent word end before the three final syllables constitute a rising rhythm. Thus the blunt ending of str. 2 (... ⁞⏑⏑⃗—‖) is a rising variation of the falling blunt ending of str. 1 (... ⁞⇉⏑—‖).

Str. 3 echoes the sequences of four and of three short syllables in a row from str. 2, but in the reversed order. Again, the sequences result in ambiguity: str. 3 can be interpreted as ⏑⏑sds's⏑⏑s‖ or as ⏑⏑sds'd⏑⏑–‖. With the former, this verse echoes the single short sequence from str. 2, according to interpretation (1); with both interpretations the sequence sd reoccurs, now for the first time with resolution of the first *longum*; with the second interpretation it reoccurs twice, s'd⏑⏑ being a variation (with juxtaposition) of sd⏑⏑ in the preceding verse according to (2) and (3), or a variation (with resolution in a different position) of s'⏑⏑d in the preceding verse according to (4).

---

[1] Quite uncharachteristically for Pindar, fixed word end occurs in between two identical metrical groups. See Dale, *Collected Papers*, p. 46; Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, § 6.1.1.

Str. 4 opens with the sequence ss, which was introduced in str. 1 and elaborated upon in str. 2; the catalexis results in the opening of str. 4 being a rising variation of the opening of str. 2. Moreover, str. 4 (in showing the sequence ... s'sds'sǁ) is built upon a variation (with juxtaposition) of the 'nuclei' ssd and dss, given by the 'mother theme' dssd in str. 1. Str. 4 thus echoes the blunt ending, with juxtaposed s, from str. 1.

Str. 5 begins as a rising variation of str. 2, showing the sequence sss͠s (str. 2: ⇉⏑—⏑—⏑⏑⏑⏑—...; str. 5: x⃗—⏑—⏑—⏑⏑⏑⏑—...). The four short syllables in a row echo str. 2 and 3. Again, they result in ambiguity: str. 5 can be interpreted as ×sss͠sdǁ, as ×ss'͠ddǁ, or as ×ssd͠'dǁ, which all, in different forms, vary upon the 'nucleus' ssd. Str. 5 is the first verse ending bluntly with a double short element.

Str. 6: The short realization of the anceps (excepting line 48), results in the verse profile being ambiguous, giving the impression of being a realization of ×ssd–, which repeats the sequence ssd in its most basic form, as it was introduced in str. 1. Thus also the opening sequence ×ss echoes the preceding verse.

As I observed above, line 56 is also the only example of word end occurring after the anceps, instead of at one of the three preferred positions in the second half of the verse. The effect of this is that line 56 is the only example of str. 6 having an 'epic (bucolic) clausula' (... ⁞—⏑⏑——ǁ). This may very well be intentional, as line 56 is the line that introduces the reference to the exploits of the man Achilles at Troy.

Str. 7, in showing the sequence ssds's, has the two 'nuclei' ssd and dss; the former in its most basic form (as it was introduced in str. 1, and seemed to reappear in str. 6), the latter with juxtaposition, which echoes the ending str. 4 exactly. Str. 7 is the fifth verse opening with a ss sequence (including str. 6), and the first one since str. 2 with a falling opening.

Str. 8: The two short syllables with which this verse begins represent an anceps or are part of a catalectic double short element. When interpreted as ×dss ... str. 8 echoes the beginning of str. 1 exactly. The interpretation as $_{\wedge}$ddss ... becomes relevant with ep. 5. The string of prolonged single short elements are reminiscent of str. 2 and 5; in fact, one could argue that the basic form in which it occurs here retrospectively gives a clue as to what the four short syllables in a row may have represented in these verses. Str. 8 gives the impression of the strophe/antistrophe being rounded off, in that it—in the fashion of circular composition—echoes the opening of str. 1, and combines it with a string of prolonged single

short elements, a feature of some of the verses that was not directly given by the 'mother theme' dssd.

Ep. 1 The short realization of the anceps (excepting line 59), results in the verse profile being ambiguous, giving the impression of it being a realization of dsdss–, which repeats the sequence dss from str. 1 in its most basic form.

Ep. 2 shows twice the sequence of four short syllables in a row, which has been introduced in str. 2 and repeated in str. 3. Again, these result in ambiguity: ep. 2 can be interpreted in many ways: ‸s⏑⏑sss⏑⏑sdss's‖, or ‸s⏑⏑ss'⏑⏑ddss's‖, or ⏑⏑dss⏑⏑sdss's‖, or ⏑⏑ds'⏑⏑ddss's‖, or ‸d⏑⏑'ss⏑⏑sdss's‖, or ‸d⏑⏑'s'⏑⏑ddss's‖. All these interpretations show different variations of the 'nuclei' dss and ssd, and of the string of (prolonged) single short elements. This line echoes the blunt ending, with juxtaposed s, from str. 1, 4, and 7. The fixed word end after the ninth syllable has the effect of the second half of ep. 2 (... ⁞⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—⏑——⏑—‖, ‸ddss's‖) resembling the beginning of str. 8 and the second half of ep. 5.

Ep. 3 shows a repetition of the 'nucleus' sd in its most basic form, articulated by juxtaposition and ending pendantly. The sequence sd's is an echo of str. 1. Thus, in working back towards the structure of str. 1, the illusion is created that the triad comes to a conclusion.

Ep. 4 (dssd'sd'ss‖) begins as a falling repetition of str. 1 (×dssd's‖), resuming, therefore, the 'mother theme' dssd from str. 1 in its complete and most basic form, while the sequence sd's echoes also the preceding verse; d'ss is an internal repetition with variation of the opening of this verse, and, consequently, also a variation of the 'nucleus' dss. In the last two triads ep. 4 ends with ... s⏑⏑s‖, which once more repeats the sequence of four short syllables on a row; this time the responsion makes clear unambiguously that it represents s⏑⏑s.

Ep. 5 shows a repeated sequence ‸dds, with which also the final verses of strophe and antistrophe open. The repetition is emphasized by means of the fixed word end after the eighth syllable. Then, the blunt ending, with juxtaposed s, reoccurs once more, echoing the endings of str. 1, 4, 7, and ep. 2. The similarity between str. 1, str. 8 and this verse becomes quite clear when they are interpreted as ×ds×d's‖, ×dssss–‖|, and ×ds×ds's‖|, respectively. The repetition of the sequence with which the concluding verse of strophe/ antistrophe begins, in combination with the echoed clausula, adds to the idea of conclusion.

Conclusion

The metrical structure of this ode can be described as a number of variations of the 'mother theme' dssd, which is introduced in str. 1. The rhythmical pattern of the entire ode is to a high degree determined by variations upon four shortened manifestations of this sequence (dss/ds, and ssd/sd). One of the most characteristic features of the metrical structure of this ode is the occurrence of sequences of three or four short syllables in a row. Even characteristically, these sequences result in a great deal of ambiguity, to the effect that the verses having them can be interpreted as combinations of different, complex variations upon the 'nuclei' dss/ds and ssd/sd given by the 'mother theme', and, at the same time, as realizations of (prolonged) single short sequences; the relevance of the latter is shown by str. 8, which has a prolonged single short sequence in its unmutilated form.

After the complex variations upon the 'nuclei' in str. 2-5, str. 6 begins to work back its way towards the 'nucleus' ssd in its basic form, which is then repeated by str. 7. Str. 8 gives the impression of the strophe/antistrophe being rounded off, in that it—in the fashion of circular composition—echoes the opening of str. 1, and combines it with a string of prolonged single short elements, a feature of some of the verses that was not directly given by the 'mother theme'.

The epode begins simply with repeating the basic 'nuclei' ds and dss. With ep. 2, then—which is not only the longest, but also the most complex and ambiguous line of this ode, having the sequence of four short syllables in a row twice—, the fireworks go off once more, in a grand way. However, its fixed word end after the ninth syllable has the effect of the second half of ep. 2 resembling the beginning of str. 8 and the second half of ep. 5. From ep. 3 onwards the rhythm returns more and more to the basic 'mother theme': ep. 3 repeats the 'nucleus' sd and the sequence sd's from str. 1. Ep. 4 begins as a falling repetition of str. 1, resuming, therefore, the 'mother theme' from str. 1 in its complete and most basic form, while the sequence sd's echoes also the preceding verse; d'ss is an internal repetition with variation of the opening of this verse, and, consequently, also a variation of the 'nucleus' dss. In the last two triads ep. 4 once more repeats the sequence of four short syllables on a row. Finally, ep. 5 shows a repetition of the sequence with which both str. 1 and str. 8 begin, which, in combination with the echoed clausula, adds to the idea of conclusion.

COMMENTARY

1-17. The Proem

• *Invocations:* Twenty-three of the fourty-five Pindaric and nine of the surviving thirteen Bacchylideic epinicia open with addresses to deities. An explanation of the genre's significant affinity with invocations in diachronical terms, supposing that the victory ode as a genre has grown out of the hymn,[1] is problematic in the light of the number of odes not opening with an invocation, which proves the synchronical situation to be one in which the epinician poet has the liberty to choose. The poet's motivation for opening with an invocation or not will depend upon the specific characteristics of the different occasions[2] and the various strategems the poet has chosen to follow in every single instance. A constant factor is the desire for solemnity (according to the principles formulated in the opening lines of *O.*6; cf. also *P.*7.1-4 and *N.*2.1-5)[3] and for the creation of a dramatic tension. An invocation is a good means to achieve the former; the latter can be realised in many ways. Here much of the tension depends upon the proemial fiction, consisting in the illusion that the ode has not started yet, and in the slow release of obligate information (see my note on 15. Ἀριστοκλείδας below, p. 271).

• *The proemial fiction:* The triple entreaty to the Muse, ἵκεο (3), ὄπαζε (9), and ἄρχε (10), together with the picture of the chorus waiting for her, in need of her voice (3/5), and the futures κοινώσομαι and ἕξει (12), create the illusion that the ode has not started yet. This fictional presentation can be paralleled by the openings of *N.*9, *O.*10, and *I.*1. "Pindar has invested the moment of performance with dramatic tension."[4] The opening presents to us the scene of excited movement and eager expectation for the ode,[5] which indirectly characterizes the current ode as something worth waiting for.

---

[1] Thus, e.g., Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 494.

[2] The invocation of Hesychia at the beginning of *P.*8, e.g., is to a high degree inspired by the current political events, as I will argue below.

[3] Cf. Most, *Maisures of Praise*, p. 23.

[4] Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, p. 112.

[5] Thus Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 16: "since ... it is an athletics victory that has occasioned the commotion and eager expectation for the song, an important indirect effect of these openings is the glorification of the victor." Cf. also his *Selected Odes*, p. 154. See further my *First Person Futures*, pp. 33-43.

• *Cultic and Rhapsodic Traditions:* William Race, in an excellent discussion of this proem (*Style and Rhetoric*, 111-3; see also *YCS* 29, 1992, 13-38), argues that "Pindar displays his genius for inventiveness in his combining rhapsodic and cultic hymnal elements" (p. 111).[6] Yet, I believe that Race overrates the rhapsodic elements in this proem. It is true that ἄρχε δ', οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ, | δόκιμον ὕμνον, 10/1, resembles familiar rhapsodic openings like Ἥλιον ὑμνεῖν αὖτε Διὸϲ τέκοϲ ἄρχεο Μοῦϲα, *h.Hom.*31, but the not unimportant difference is that Pindar does not refer to the theme of what is to follow as a direct object (or object-clause) of the imperative.[7] Since lines 10/1 maintain the hymnic 'Du-stil' of the preceding lines and formulate an entreaty that follows naturally upon the hymnic entreaties preceding ('Muse, come, you are needed, provide song: begin now'), there is much to say for taking the entire proem as a literary imitation of a cultic hymn. The particularity in this case is that it is a cultic hymn to the Muse. Thus it is the specific deity that is reminiscent of rhapsodic traditions, whereas the form of the prayer is entirely cultic. In other words, an elaborate cultic hymn to the Muse here takes the place of a rhapsodic opening like 'Muse, sing about the victory.'

• *Choral or solo performance:* The opening triad of *N.*3 is incompatible with the recently advanced hypothesis that Pindar's victory odes were not composed to be sung by a chorus, as it is commonly believed, but as solos.[8] Lines 4/5 and 11/2 unequivocally refer to the chorus of young men who performed this ode. See my notes on these lines (pp. 249, 267/8) and on lines 65/6 below (pp. 373/4).

---

[6] On these cultic and rhapsodic forms of hymns in general see Norden, *Agnostos Theos*; Miller, *Hymn to Apollo*, pp. 1-5, Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, pp. 271-4; Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 102-6. Further references are to be found there.

[7] Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, p. 112, interprets 10/1 as 'begin for your father who rules the cloud-covered sky a proper hymn', in which case the entreaty is admittedly more 'rhapsodic', since the theme would be defined as 'a hymn for Zeus'. However, as I argue below in my note *ad loc.*, there are major objections against this interpretation, not least of all that *N.*3 is not a hymn for Zeus.

[8] The solo hypothesis has been advanced in a series of articles: M. Heath, 'Receiving the κῶμοϲ The Context and Performance of Epinician', *AJP* 109, 1988, 180-195; Mary R. Lefkowitz, 'Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?', *AJP* 109, 1988, 1-11 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 191-201); Malcolm Davies, 'Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Handbook', *CQ* 38, 1988, 52-64; M. Heath & Mary R. Lefkowitz, 'Epinician Performance', *CPh* 86, 1991, 173-191. The case for the chorus has been defended by: Anne Burnett, 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CPh* 84, 1989, 283-293; C. Carey, 'The Performance of the Victory Ode', *AJP* 110, 1989, 545-565; C. Carey, 'The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus', *CPh* 86, 1991, 192-200. Both articles in *CPh* 86, 1991, 173-200, together provide a convenient overview of the debate. The debate has been carried on by: J.M. Bremer, 'Pindar's Paradoxical ἐγώ and a Recent Controversy about the

Strophe A

1-5

Lady Muse, our mother, I beg you, come in the holy Nemean month to the Dorian island Aegina, where many stangers come. For by the Asopian water young men, architects of sweet voiced processions, are waiting, in desire of your voice.

1. ὦ πότνια Μοῖcα

Although Pindar calls upon the Muses, both in plural and in singular very frequently, only in one other ode (*P.*4) does Pindar begin by invoking a single Muse alone.[9] The exceptional invocation of one single Muse at the beginning of this ode must have reminded Pindar's audience of epic tradition. There is, however, a difference between the traditional epic invocation of the Muse and her role here. Usually in epic the Muse is entreated to 'sing' or to 'tell' and the theme of what is to follow is mentioned as a direct object (or object-clause) of the imperative.[10] Here the Muse is first entreated to come to the place where the ode is to be performed, before line 10 exhorts her to sing. For the idea of the Muses being present at the place where the celebration takes place cf. *P.*4.1-3,[11] *O.*11.16-9; cf. also Sapph.*frr.*127, 128 V.

πότνια is used by Pindar exclusively in the vocative and nominative to qualify female deities, such as 'Αγλαΐα, one of the Graces (*O.*14.13), "Ωρα (*N.*8.1), Persephone (*fr.*37), and Aphrodite (*P.*4.213). In *P.*9.55 it qualifies Λιβύα, apparently regarded as a deity. In *Pae.*9.10 it qualifies 'Ακτὶc

---

Performance of his Epinicia', in: *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric, Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (ed. S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1990, 41-58; K.A. Morgan, 'Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the Κῶμοc', *CPh* 88, 1993, 1-15; G.B. D'Alessio, 'First-Person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39, 1994, 117-139; M. Anzai, 'First-Person Forms in Pindar: A Re-examination', *BICS* 39, 1994, 141-150; M.R. Lefkowitz, 'The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered—Again', *BICS* 1995, 139-150.

[9] The invocation of one single Muse at the beginning of *P.*4 concurs with the fact that this ode is the most 'epic' Pindaric ode by far. It is the longest and the most narrative of all extant odes. Cf. also τίc γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίαc, | τίc δὲ κίνδυνοc κρατεροῖc ἀδάμαντοc δῆcεν ἅλοιc; lines 70/1, introducing the main narrative section of this ode (70-262). See also Braswell on *P.*4.1-3 (pp. 57-8). In *N.*9.1 he addresses the Muses as a group and in *O.*10.3/4 he addresses one single Muse together with 'Αλάθεια. Bacchylides invokes the Muses in plural at the beginning of his first ode. He invokes Clio, by name, at the beginning of the third and twelfth ode. For a convenient inventory of all the places where Pindar mentions or addresses the Muse(s) see Marianne van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs*, p. 47.

[10] Cf. e.g. *Il.*1.1, *Il.*16.112/3, *h.Ven.*1, etc. Cf. also B.15.47-9. See also Kirk on *Il.*1.1 (p. 51) and Richardson on *h.Cer.*1-3.

[11] "To ask a Muse to stand beside someone is not very different from summoning her with δεῦρο or a similar expression", Braswell on *P.*4.1-2 (p. 60).

ἀελίου, called upon in the first line and personified as μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων in 2. πότνια has an epic flavour, but it nowhere qualifies a Muse in epic tradition. Homer uses it as a fixed epithet of Hera (*Il.*1.551, etc.) and of minor female deities (*Il.*4.2, 5.592, *Od.*1.14, 8.448). The combination with μᾶτερ here and in *Pae.*9.10 echoes the epic formula πότνια μήτηρ (*Il.*1.357, *Od.*6.30, 18.5).

1. μᾶτερ ἁμετέρα

The plural **ἁμετέρα** is equivalent to a singular (ἐμά). Pindar is calling upon the Muse as his mother. The possibility of the chorus speaking in their own *persona* is implausible: the chorus are referred to in the third person in lines 4/5. Moreover, the plural ἁμᾶς in line 9, qualifying μήτιος, can hardly be considered to include the chorus as well as the poet, and is even more clearly than *h.l.* equivalent to a singular. In line 11 the singular ἐγώ is used in a context which distinguished the poet's tasks from the chorus'. All three first person pronouns have the same reference: the poet.

For a plural possessive pronoun with singular reference cf. μήδεσιν ἀνσπάσσαντες ἁμοῖς, *P.*4.27, where Medea claims that the ship was drawn to shore on her advice. Cf. also πεύθομαι γάρ νιν (*sc.* τιμάν) Πελίαν ἄθεμιν λευκαῖς πιθήσαντα φρασὶν | ἁμετέρων ἀποσυλᾶσαι βιαίως ἀρχεδικᾶν τοκέων, *P.*4.109/10, and ἁμετέρων τοκέων, *P.*4.150, where Jason is speaking about his parents, although the possibility is not excluded that Jason is including his brother(s) and/or sister(s) in the plural notion ἁμετέρων. Similarly, in λίσσομαι παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίας | ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ξεῖνον ἁμὸν μοιρίδιον τελέσαι, *I.*6.45/6, Heracles is praying to Zeus that Telamon might have a son that will be his ξεῖνος, although it is possible that Heracles uses the plural ἁμόν because he thinks of Telamon's son as a ξεῖνος of his family.

There are a few more cases like *h.l.* where Pindar uses ἁμέτερος or ἁμός to refer to himself: In ἤθελον Χίρωνά κε Φιλλυρίδαν, εἰ χρεὼν τοῦθ' ἁμετέρας ἀπὸ γλώσσας κοινὸν εὔξασθαι ἔπος, | ζώειν τὸν ἀποιχόμενον, *P.*3.1-3, the first person singular main verb proves that ἁμετέρας is used instead of a singular. τὰ μὲν ἁμετέρα | γλῶσσα ποιμαίνειν ἐθέλει, *O.*11.8/9, and εἰ δὲ σώφρων ἄντρον ἔναι' ἔτι Χίρων, καί τί οἱ | φίλτρον ⟨ἐν⟩ θυμῷ μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι | ἁμέτεροι τίθεν, ἰατῆρα τοί κέν νιν πίθον | καί νυν ἐσλοῖσιν παρασχεῖν θερμᾶν νόσων, *P.*3.63-6, are probably similar, but it cannot be excluded that the chorus speak in their own *persona.*

The metaphorical use of **μᾶτερ** is striking. Not only does the poet acknowledge his dependence upon the Muse, he even emphasises his close personal ties with her, in the spirit of ἐκ γάρ τοι Μουσάων καὶ ἑκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος | ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν, Hes.*Th.*94/5. Cf. also *O.*1.111/2 (note τρέφει). For Pindar's other mother see *I.*1.1.

1. λίccομαι

For λίccομαι with the (depending) content of the entreaty expressed in an imperative, cf. λίccομαι, παῖ Ζηνὸc Ἐλευθερίου, | Ἱμέραν εὐρυcθενέ' ἀμφιπόλει, *O.*12.1/2; λίccομαι νεῦcον, Κρονίων, ... | ὄφρα κτλ, *P.*1.71/2; μὴ πρόλειπε, λίccομαι, πάτερ, A.*Supp.*748; μή, λίccομαί c', αὖδα τάδε, S.*Aj.*368; *OT* 650, Ar.*Pax* 382.

2. πολυξέναν

For the importance of ξενία for the Aeginetan society, see my note on *N.*5.9 (pp. 111/2) and *N.*5 'Interpretation' (pp. 62-88). Within the context of the fictional presentation, this reference to Aegina's hospitality performs the function of an argument to convince the Muse to act upon the entreaty and come to Aegina[12].

For **πολύξενοc** cf. *O.*1.93, *fr.*122.1. Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, p. 113 n. 73, suggested that "the prominent **τάν** (2) may imply that Aigina's hospitality is well known". The article (or demonstrative) rather mirrors the speaker's (Pindar's) assumption that Aegina itself is well known to his addressee (the Muse).[13] This is functional, as it suggests that the Muse has been there before, which is illustrative of the great heroic and athletic tradition of Aegina (cf. also *O.*11.16-9).

2. ἐν ἱερομηνίαι Νεμεάδι

The scholiast explains: οἱ δὲ ἱερὸν μῆνα καθόλου λέγουcι κεκλῆcαι, ἐν ὧι τὰ Νέμεα ἄγεται (4, III 42 Dr.). For ἱερόν as a qualification of the Great Games cf. *O.*8.64, *N.*2.4, *N.*6.59. For the noun ἱερομηνία cf. e.g. Th.3.56.

ὀψέ περ in 80 below indicates that there had been some delay in Pindar's delivery of this ode (see my note, pp. 410-2). ἐν ἱερομηνίαι Νεμεάδι suggests that the performance of this ode took place in the Nemean season nevertheless. Probably this ode was performed on the anniversary of the victory. This temporal reference has the additional effect of imparting to the audience where the victor has won. Nemea is mentioned again in line 18. See also my note on 3-4. ὕδατι ἐπ' Ἀcωπίωι (pp. 247/8).

3. ἵκεο Δωρίδα νᾶcον Αἴγιναν

The Muse is entreated to come to Aegina. Thus the reference to the victor's place of origin, one of the stock themes in a victory-ode, is embedded in the (fictional) proemial discourse.

---

[12] Cf. Dissen *ad loc.* (p. 376). Cf. also ἐγγυάcομαι | ὔμμιν, ὦ Μοῖcα, φυγόξεινον cτρατὸν | μήτ' ἀπείρατον καλῶν | ... ἀφίξεcθαι, *O.*11.16-9.

[13] The parallel Race adduces (καὶ τὰν θεμίξενον ἀρετάν, *Pae.*6.131) fits his interpretation, but is not comparable to *h.l.* The adjective in *Pae.*6 defines, here it is a commenting qualification.

Δωριεύς is used four times to qualify Aegina or the Aeginetan people (Δωριεῖ λαῶι, *O.*8.30; ἔδεκτο Κίρραθεν ἐςτεφανωμένον | υἱὸν ποίαι Παρναςςίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμωι, *P.*8.19/20, i.e. 'with an Aeginetan procession'; cὺν θεῶν δέ νιν [*sc.* Αἴγιναν] αἴςαι | Ὕλλου τε καὶ Αἰγιμιοῦ | Δωριεὺς ἐλθὼν cτρατός | ἐκτίςςατο, *I.*9.1-4; ὀνο]μακλύτα γ' ἔνεςςι Δωριεῖ μ[ε]δέοιςα [πό]ντωι | νᾶςος, *Pae.*6.123-5, all four of them in Aeginetan odes.

The only other occurrance in Pindar is *P.*1.65, in an ode for Hieron, where Δωριεῖς refers to the Lacedaemonians). The female equivalent Δωρίς is used only here of Aegina (the only other occurance is Δωρίδ' ἀποικίαν ... Λακεδαιμονίων, *I.*7.12-4, in an ode for a Theban victor). The adjective Δώριος is used in *O.*1.17, 3.5, *fr.*191, and 67 to qualify Dorian lyric poetry, especially its music, and in *N.*5.37, *I.*2.15, and 8.64 for the Isthmus of Corinth.

The picture that emerges out of this is that the Aeginetan elite proudly claimed Dorian descent. It is a fact that Aegina became 'Dorianized' in the early first millennium, although the precise process is a matter of much dispute.[14] Greek mythology and historiography regard the Dorian inhabitants of Aegina as the successors of the Aeacids (cf. esp. *I.*9.1-4, *v.i.*) and it is recorded that they lived together peacefully.[15] In the archaic period Aegina maintained close ties with Epidaurus and Argos, both Dorian cities. It is striking, from a logical point of view, that Pindar's odes present the Aeginetan elite both as lineal descendants of the Aeacids[16] and as Dorians. Moreover, there seems to be an inconsistency between what Pindar says in *O.*8.25-30, χώραν ... | Δωριεῖ λαῶι ταμιευομέναν ἐξ Αἰακοῦ, which cannot be understood otherwise than that Aeacus is presented as the first Dorian inhabitant of Aegina,[17] and what he says in *I.*9.1-4, cὺν θεῶν δέ νιν (*sc.* Αἴγιναν) αἴςαι | Ὕλλου τε καὶ Αἰγιμιοῦ | Δωριεὺς ἐλθὼν cτρατός | ἐκτίςςατο, where the Dorians are said to have come to Aegina led by Hyllus, the son of Heracles, and Aegimius, the father of Dymas and Pamphylus and one of the founders of the Dorian race (cf. *P.*1.61-5, *P.*5.69-72), as Heracles was considered to be of the same generation of the sons of Aeacus, Peleus and Telamon, who undertook an expedition to Troy under his lead (*N.*4.25-32, *I.*5.34-8, *I.*6.24-56, *fr.*172).

---

[14] On this matter, see Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 170-3, 180-4.

[15] Aegina was colonized by Dorians from Epidaurus according to Hdt.8.46, or by Argives from Epidaurus led by Deiphontes according to Paus.2.29.5, who regards these Dorian invaders as cύνοικοι of the earlier Aeginetans (Αἰγινήταις τοῖς ἀρχαίοις); Aegina was regarded as a colony of Argos by Σ.*ad h.l.* vs.1; Σ.*ad O.*8.39 (cf. Σ.*ad P.*8.29a) mentions Triacon of Argos as the oecist of Aegina; Strab.8.6.16 mentions Argives, Cretans, and Epidaurians as settlers of Aegina.

[16] See my note on *N.*5.8 (Αἰακίδας) and *N.*5 'Interpretation' (*passim*).

[17] On this citation, see Müller, *Liber Aegineticorum*, 21-5; Figueira, *Aegina*, 173.

It must be noted that this seemingly illogical buttering of the Aeginetan bread on both sides does not necessarily prove that Pindar or his audience were inconsistent thinkers; it rather goes to show that they did not bother as much as we do about consistency in such matters.[18] Moreover, it must be noted to our consolation that both viewpoints about the Aeginetan origins are never explicitly juxtaposed; given the occasional nature of the genre, the chances of Pindar's audience even being aware of the inconsistency are considerably smaller than in our case.

3-4. ὕδατι γὰρ | μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίωι

The reference is to the well, or stream, called Asopis on Aegina. γάρ indicates that the statement ὕδατι ... μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίωι μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κώμων νεανίαι is a motivation of the entreaty to the Muse to come to Aegina. The periphrasis is a means of highlighting the concept 'water,' which can be connected with lines 6 and 76-9.

For the identification of the stream, cf. the *Etymologicum Magnum, s.v.* Ἀμφορίτης· ὅτι ἐν Αἰγίνηι ἔδραμον περὶ τὴν Ἀσωπίδα κρήνην ὑδρεύσασθαι. ὅθεν καὶ ἀγὼν ἄγεται ἀμφορίτης λεγόμενος παρὰ τοῖς Αἰγινήταις, ἐν ὧι οἱ ἐκεῖσε ἐγωνιζόμενοι τοὺς κεράμους ὕδατος πεπληρωμώνους ἀναλαβόντες κατὰ τῶν ὤμων τρέχουσι περὶ τῆς νίκης, φιλονεικοῦντες κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἡρώων.[19] See also Privitera, *QUCC* 28, 1988, 63-70 (and, independently, Richard Stoneman in an unpublished Oxford dissertation). This stream is identified with the stream called Σκοτεινή today by Γ.Ν. Μπῆτρος, Ὑποστράτηγος, πρόεδρος κοινότ. Αἰγίνης, and Στ. Ἐμμ. Λυκούδης, πλοίαρχος Π. Ναυτικοῦ, in the *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, Athens 1927, vol. II p. 462, *s.v.* Αἴγινα.[20]

Asopus is a river-god, the father of Aegina and Thebe (cf. *I*.8.15-23; cf. also Hdt.5.80, Paus.2.5.1, D.S.4.72.1). There are many rivers called Asopus in Greece. The most famous ones are river Asopus in Boeotia, and river Asopus flowing past Phlius near Nemea. It is this latter river

---

[18] For similar inconsistencies in Greek (and Roman) religion see H.S. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion*, vol. 1: *Ter Unus*, Leiden 1989; vol. 2: *Tradition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*, Leiden 1993.

[19] The 'historical' example of this race was given by the Argonauts (A.R. 4.1764/5, Apollod.1.9.26, Callimachus, cited in Σ.*ad O*.7.86 [156b Dr.], *fr*.198 Pf.; see Reisch, *RE* I 1976, *s.v.* Ἀμφορίτης ἀγών).

[20] "Οὐδὲν ποτάμιον ἔχει ἡ Αἴγινα· χειμάρρους ὅμως ἱκανούς. ... Τῆς *Σκοτεινῆς*, ὁ μεγαλύτερος πάντων, ὁ «Ἀσωπὸς» τῶν ἀρχαίων, πηγάζων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ψωμᾶ Κοτρῶνι καὶ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν τοῦ ὀροπεδίου τῆς Μονῆς τῆς Παναγίας, διέρχεται μεταχὺ Ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου καὶ Ψωμᾶ Κοτρῶνι καὶ παραθέων τὰς ὑπωρείας τοῦ Βουνοῦ τοῦ Δένδρου καὶ τοῦ Παγώνη, ἐκβάλλει βορείως τῆς ἄκρας Παλαιόπυργος (ἢ Ἀώνη), ἧς τὰ ἀβαθῆ ὁλονὲν προσεπιχώνει καὶ διευρύνει. Παράδοξον πῶς διετηρήθη ἡ ἔννοια τῆς ἀρχαιοτάτης ὀνομασίας εἰς τὴν σύγχρονον τοιαύτην, δεδομένου ὅτι ὁ *Ἀσωπὸς* ὤφειλε τὴν ὀνομασίαν τοῦ εἰς τὴν «ἄσσον» δηλαδὴ εἰς τὸ σκοτεινόν του ὕγωρ, λόγωι τῆς ἀναμίξεώς του μὲ χῶμα (Πρβλ. etym. M. λέξ. «Ἀσωπός»)".

Pindar is referring to in *N.*9.9, where he mentions the foundation of the Pythian Games at Sicyon. In ὑδάτ⟨εςς⟩ι δ' ἐπ' Ἀς[ω]ποῦ π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων βαθύκολπον ἀνερέψατο παρθένον Αἴγιναν (*sc.* Ζεύς), *Pae.*6.134-7, almost the same expression as *h.l.* is used to refer to the location where Zeus carried off Aegina from her father to abduct her to the island that was in those days called Oenona (or Oenopia), and afterwards Aegina. Tradition has recorded both Phlius (D.S.4.72.5, Tz. ad Luc. 176) and Boeotia (Σ.*ad* A.R.1.117, Call.*Del.*77) as the scene where this happened.

As for *h.l.* the scholia disagree as to whether this expression refers to river Asopus near Phlius, to the Boeotian Asopus, or to a river Asopus on Aegina itself[21] and so did scholars in the past.[22] Of course, the last possibility is the only one worth considering, because it would be preposterous for Pindar to ask the Muse to come to Aegina while his chorus is waiting for her near Phlius or in Boeotia. Wilamowitz and Bury (*locc. citt.*) came to the same conclusion, although they did not have independent evidence for the existence of a river called Asopus on Aegina except for the scholia cited.

The verb **μένοντ'**, together with μαιόμενοι in the next line, the imperatives ὄπαζε (9) and especially ἄρχε (10), and the futures κοινάςομαι and ἕξει (12), creates the illusion that the ode has not started yet. For a more detailed analysis of this procedure see my note on 12. κοινώςομαι below.

4-5. μελιγαρύων τέκτονες | κώμων νεανίαι

The 'young men, architects of sweet voiced processions' are the chorus performing this ode. The *suppressed tenor* of the *vehicle* τέκτονες is something like 'those who bring about, performers.' Both craftsmen and choruses are engaged in bringing about something worthwhile and they do so with skill. The implied comparison between the chorus and craftsmen is illustrative of the intricacy, of the composite nature of the ode and its performance, carefully put together (cf. Μοῖςά

---

[21] Οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνηι ἀλλ' ἐν Νεμέαι· ὁ γὰρ Ἀςωπὸς οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνηι, ἀλλὰ περὶ Φλειοῦντά ἐςτι καὶ Νεμέαν, Σ. 1c (III 41 Dr.); ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος διηπατῆςθαί φηςι τοὺς ὑπομνηματιςαμένους τῆι ὁμωνυμίαι τῶν ποταμῶν· οἱ γὰρ Ἀςωποὶ πλείους, ὧν ἕνα φηςὶν εἶναι καὶ τὸν ἐν Αἰγίνηι· ὁ δὲ Καλλίςτρατος Ἀςωπίδα ἐν Αἰγίνηι. δύναται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν Βοιωτίαι Ἀςωποῦ ποταμοῦ ἀκούεςθαι, ὡς τῶν ἐξ Αἰγίνης χορευτῶν τῶι Πινδάρωι προςλιπαρούντων ἕνεκα τοῦ γράφειν Ἀριςτοκλείδηι τὸν ἐπίνικον, Σ. 1c (III 42 Dr.); ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις, Σ. 6a (III 43 Dr.).

[22] Heyne thinks the expression refers to the Asopus near Phlius. Dissen (*ap.* A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera*, Lipsiae 1821, II 2, 364): "ne dubites nunc Asopum fuisse rivulum prope urbem Aeginam"; thus also Bury (p. 45): "although there is no evidence beyond this passage, it would seem that there was a stream named Asopus near the city Aegina", and Wilamowitz (p. 277 n. 2): "auf Aegina gibt es keinen wirklichen Fluß, aber es könnte immerhin ein ῥεῦμα den stolzen Name erhalten haben. ... Es konnte auch eine Quelle sein". However, Farnell (II p. 254) identifies this water with the Theban Asopus, supposing that the Aeginetan youths went to Pindar's home in order to persuade him to write this ode.

τοι | κολλᾶι χρυcὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ᾽ ἁμᾶ | καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίαc ὑφελοῖc᾽ ἐέρcαc, *N.*7.77-9; for the ideal of ποικιλία see further my introduction, pp. 22/3). Moreover, the image suggests a parallelism between the performance and the more permanent products of craftsmen.

In the opening lines of *O.*6 Pindar compares his own activities as a poet to the concerns of an archtect. Pindar often uses τέκτων in a metaphorical way: τέκτονα νωδυνίαc ἥμερον γυιαρκέοc Ἀcκλαπιόν, *P.*3.6; χρὴ δ᾽ ἀπ᾽ Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον᾽ ἀεθληταῖcιν ἔμμεν, *N.*5.49; ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν τέκτονεc οἷα cοφοὶ | ἅρμοcαν, *P.*3.113/4. For the **κῶμοc** see my notes on *P.*8.19/20 and *P.*8.70 (pp. 500-2, 561-6). For **μελίγαρυc**, cf. *O.*11.4, *P.*3.64, *I.*2.3, Alcm.*fr.*26.1/2 (*PMG*); cf. also κώμωι ... ἀδυμελεῖ, *P.*8.70.

• *Choral or solo performance:* Heath and Lefkowitz, *CPh* 86, 1991, 186-8, interpret the μελιγαρύων τέκτονεc | κώμων νεανίαι (4/5) as the *audience* of the victory song performed by Pindar.[23] This entails that cέθεν ὄπα μαιόμενοι (5) has to be interpreted as 'desiring to hear,' instead of 'desiring to sing.' According to Heath and Lefkowitz the song that has been sung by the young men in the κῶμοc before Pindar's performance of his own ode might be something like the τήνελλα καλλινίκη, or some other song suitable to the occasion. This song would be referred to by ὀάροιc in line 11: ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ μιν ὀάροιc | λύραι τε κοινώcομαι (11/2) is interpreted by Heath and Lefkowitz as 'I will share my present hymn with the song sung already by the komasts and with my lyre by which I will accompany myself now.' Carey, *CPh* 86, 1991, 196/7, rightly objected: "Pindar describes the young men as singers desiring his song and promises to supply it. To take these singers as fellow-komasts who have their own song(s) and who wish only to hear Pindar's solo performance is to supply a second song where Pindar speaks only of one (his) and to introduce the notion of singers as audience. To conclude that the singers perform Pindar's song is incontrovertibly to make more economical use of Pindar's words, for it involves only one song, that mentioned in the text, one role, that mentioned in the text for the singers, to sing." If Pindar had wished to motivate his entreaty to the Muse to come to Aegina and inspire his song by saying that there is an audience longing for it, why would he have chosen the komasts of all people to represent his audience? After all, they cannot be supposed to be the part of the audience that was most eager to hear an epinicion for the victor. With respect to lines 11/2, Carey observed that "if the lyre is an instrument for the performance of *N.*3, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the voices perform the same role, given the close syntactic association of lyre and voices."

[23] "The audience consists of Aeginetan komasts, and komasts typically sing ...; so Pindar's solo song contributes to a celebration that also involves unison singing (he will 'share' his song with the young men's voices and with the lyre)", p. 186.

5. σέθεν ὄπα μαιόμενοι

μαίομαι means 'to look for.'

Either for something or someone whose location is unknown: Cf. ὡς ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτες ἄγαγον, κτλ, *O.*1.46; μαιομένη κευθμῶνας ἀνὰ σπέος, *Od.*13.367; *Il.*9.393/4, Hes.*Op.*532, A.R.2.126. Or, as here, for something or someone one wants to have: Cf. λόγο[ν ἄν]ακτος Εὐξαν[τίου] {ς} ἐπαίνεσα [Κρητ]ῶν μαιομένων ὃς ἀνα[ίνετο] | αὐταρχεῖν, *Pae.*4.35-7; καὶ ποθήω καὶ μάομαι, Sapph.*fr.*36 V.[24]; ἦλθες, †καὶ† ἐπόησας, ἐγὼ δέ σ' ἐμαιόμαν | ὂν δ' ἔψυξας ἔμαν φρένα καιομέναν πόθωι, Sapph.*fr.*48 V.; especially when it is used with an inf.: λόγον ἀνθρώπων πέρι | μαιομένων μεγάλαν | ἀρετὰν θυμῶι λαβεῖν, *O.*8.4-6; μαιομένους ἰδεῖν, A.*Ch.*787; sometimes with the connotation 'to pursue': θεόθεν ἐραίμαν καλῶν, | δυνατὰ μαιόμενος ἐν ἁλικίαι, *P.*11.50/1; Alc.*fr.*141.3/4 V.

Of the noun ***ὄψ**, 'voice' (or rather *ὤψ, cf. Latin vōx), only the gen., dat., and acc. sg. are attested. It has an epic flavour; it is frequent in Homer (*Il.*16.76, 18.222, *Od.*10.221, etc.); Hesiod uses it (e.g. *Th.*41), as well as some archaic poets (Thgn.532, B.16.129), and tragedians (in lyric passages: A.*Supp.*60, S.*El.*1068; in messenger speeches: E.*Hel.*1596; and in: E.*Hec.*555 [del. Jacobs], *Hipp.*1321). For Pindar, cf. *P.*4.283, *Pae.*8.75, *fr.dub.*333a.14; cf. also *Pae.*6.175 (with Radt and Snell-Maehler). For the noun referring to the singing of a victory ode, cf. *P.*10.5/6, *P.*10.55/6, *N.*7.82/4, lines 65/6 below.

For **σέθεν** used as an attributive adjunct (thus not in epic) cf. οὐκ ἄτερ παίδων σέθεν, *O.*8.45; *I.*1.54/5, *I.*7.14/5, *O.*6.80/1; cf. esp. Σωτὴρ ὑψινεφὲς Ζεῦ, ... | ἱκέτας σέθεν ἔρχομαι Λυδίοις ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς, | αἰτήσων κτλ, *O.*5.17-20, where σέθεν is used instead of an objective genitive.[25] Cf. also κατθάνοισα δὲ κείσηι οὐδέ ποτα μναμοσύνα σέθεν | ἔσσετ', Sapph.*fr.*55.1/2; A.*Th.*141/2; A.*Eu.*227/8, A.*Ag.*882/3, etc. In all these examples a genitive (σοῦ, σέο, or σεῦ) would have been a plausible alternative. Contrast ὅρα δὲ πληγὰς τάσδε καρδίαι σέθεν, A.*Eu.*103, where a genitive would have been awkward.

In epic σέθεν is used as a metrical alternative for σοῦ, σέο, or σεῦ. Cf. ἐκ σέθεν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν, *h.Dian.*8, with ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρχάμενος, *h.Sol.*18; cf. ἐγὼ δὲ σέθεν πολὺ χείρων, *Il.*20.434, with οὐδέ τις ἐν Λυκίηι σέο γ' εὔχεται εἶναι ἀμείνων, *Il.*5.173 (7.114, 16.709, 21.107, *Od.*2.180) and ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν, *Il.*1.186, with οἵ σέο φέρτεροί εἰσι, *Il.*2.201, (15.181, 16.722, 17.168); cf. σέο δ' εἵνεκ', *Il.*6.328 (3.206, 14.309), with σέθεν εἵνεκα, *Il.*16.539 (*Od.*16.31, 19.377); cf. ἠράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Sapph.*fr.*49.1, with σέο νῦν ἔραμαι, *Il.*14.328; cf. σέθεν ζώοντος ἀκούων, *Il.*24.490, with μή σευ νῦν ἔτι πατρὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἀκούσω, *Il.*21.475 (24.767, *Od.*14.493); etc. I am aware of only one passage in Homer where σέθεν necessarily has an

---

[24] Cf. ΜΑΜΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΤΕΩ, *Inscr.vasc.Attici* (s. V) *ap.* Studniczka, *JbdInstAth* 2, 1887, 162 (= Kretschner, *Vaseninschriften* n° 54, p. 86).

[25] To the effect that σέθεν refers to the opposite of the place whence; Bowra (*Odes of Pindar*, p. 239) translates: 'suppliant to thee I come'.

'ablative' value: ἀλλά μοι αἰνὸν ἄχος cέθεν ἔccεται, ὦ Μενέλαε, Ι αἴ κε θάνηιc καὶ πότμον ἀναπλήcηιc βιότοιο, *Il.*4.169/70.

In Pindar there are three examples of (non-attributive) cέθεν necessarily meaning 'originating from you, coming from you,' where cοῦ, cέο, or cεῦ cannot be regarded as alternatives: 'Ορτυγία, Ι ... cέθεν ἁδυεπὴc Ι ὕμνοc ὁρμᾶται θέμεν Ι αἶνον ἀελλοπόδων μέγαν ἵππων, *N.*1.2-6; [Ναΐδ]οc Θρονίαc, Ἄβδηρε χαλκοθώραξ, Ι [Ποc]ειδᾶνόc τε παῖ, Ι [cέθ]εν[26] Ἰάονι τόνδε λαῶι [παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω, *Pae.*2.1-4; μαχαίραι τάμον κατὰ μέλη, Ι τραπέζαιcί τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν Ι cέθεν διεδάcαντο καὶ φάγον, *O.*1.49-51, where cέθεν denotes the origin of the food distributed. Furthermore, there are six examples where cέθεν can be imagined to have its 'ablative' value, although a genitive could have been used instead: three instances of attributive cέθεν qualifying offspring (cited above), and three instances of cέθεν with a preposition denoting origin or separation (*P.*1.87/8, *I.*3.4/5, *N.*7.1/2).

6-9

*Each thing thirsts for something different. To victory in the Games song belongs best, most favourable attendant on crowns and [deeds of] manliness. Provide abundance of it [*sc. *song] from my skill.*

6-8

The priamel serves as a motivation of the entreaty to the Muse to come to Aegina, in that it explains why she is needed: A song is needed, because of an ἀεθλονικία. Although here the emphasis is on desire, these lines are certainly a variation of the common χρέοc motif. See my note on *P.*8.33 (pp. 513-5).

6. διψῆι δὲ πρᾶγοc ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου

'Each thing thirsts for something different'. The verb **διψάω** is used metaphorically in the sense of 'thirsting for, longing for.' It elaborates upon μαιόμενοι of the preceding sentence, referring to the same idea in a more intensified, poetical and metaphorical way. The association of διψῆι with water effects thematic continuity from 1-5 (featuring a river in 3/4) to 6ff. Moreover, the fact that φιλεῖ in line 7 appears to express the same idea as διψῆι here, associates the ἀοιδάν in line 7 with drink ('everything thirsts for something else; victory likes [i.e. thirsts for] song'). This association will recur at the end of this ode, where the song is called a πόμ' ἀοίδιμον (79).

---

[26] Cf. Σ.*ad loc.* (Radt, *Zweiter und Sechster Paian*, p.13*): ἀπὸ cοῦ τ(ὴν) ἀρχὴν λαβών. Radt remarks on cέθεν (*ibid.* p. 26): "-θεν hat hier seine ursprungliche ablativische Kraft".

For the metaphor cf. πόλις ἐλευθερίας διψήσασα, Pl.*R.*562c. Cf. also ἐμὲ δ' οὖν τις ἀοιδᾶν | δίψαν ἀκειόμενον πράσσει χρέος, *P.*9.103/4. The verb is used by Pindar only *h.l.* and in μὴ νῦν νέκταρ[ρ.........]νας ἐμᾶς διψῶντ' α[...........] παρ' ἁλμυρὸν | οἴχεσθον, *fr.*94b.76-8. Cf. also τὸ μὲν γὰρ διψῆν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ ἐπιθυμεῖν, Artemid.*Oneirocrit.*1.68.

πρᾶγος occurs only here in Pindar and in θεοῦ δὲ δείξαντος ἀρχὰν | ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος, *fr.*108a.1/2; it may have been the reading of *fr.*70d.21 (π]ραγεσιν). Cf. also A.*Th.*2, 861 (anap.), *Pers.*248 (troch.), S.*Ichn.*74, Ar.*Av.*112, *Lys.*706 (paratragoedia).

•*Particle usage:* The particle **δέ** in line 6 connects this line to the preceding sentence, marking it as a next, independent step in the sequence. διψῆι δὲ πρᾶγος ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου is a generic statement, in which the particle **μέν** anticipates that something else will follow. The hearer may expect that what will follow is an application of this generic statement to the preceding context. The particle **δέ** in line 7 balances μέν in 6, and the hearer's expectation is fulfilled, for this line contains a specific case of the principle formulated in 6: 'victory in the Games is most in need of song'. At this point the hearer is capable of making the link with the preceding context: apparently a song is needed because of a victory having been won at the Games. Thus, lines 6-7 turn out to be a further explanation why a song is needed; but, unlike lines 3-5, lines 6-7 are not explicitly marked as such (e.g. by means of γάρ). The role played by these particles in relation to the distribution of *topics* in these lines can be described as follows. δέ in line 6 marks διψῆι as the *topic* of the sentence as a whole (6-8). διψῆι is what could be called a *dicourse topic*, which is, as it were, the umbrella unifying the two different *sentence topics* of line 6 and lines 7/8 respectively.[27] These two *sentence topics* are mentioned in the positions before μέν and δέ (7): πρᾶγος ἄλλο and ἀεθλονικία. μέν and δέ balance these *sentence topics* on the same level. The latter attains more emphasis than the former because the former is more general than the latter and the latter has more relevance to the actual situation (not because the second member of two notions balanced by μέν and δέ as a rule gets more emphasis, as it is sometimes believed). The layering of *topics* can be brought out by the following paraphrase: 'We talk about being thirsty, about being in need of something: as for each thing, it is in need of something else; as for a victory, this is in need of a song'.

---

[27] The distinction between *discourse topics* and *sentence topics* is borrowed from J. van Oosten, 'A Unified View of Topic', *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley (California) 1984, 372-385.

For the 'summary priamel,' i.e., the 'foil' appearing in summary or gnomic form, see Bundy, I p. 5, and p. 7 with n. 23,[28] where he observes that this kind of 'summary priamel' often involves the idioms **ἄλλοι ἄλλα** or ἕτεροι ἕτερα, or the like. Cf., e.g., ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ... καί νυν ... κατέβαν, τὰν ποντίαν | ὑμνέων ... Ῥόδον, *O.*7.11-4; *O.*8.12-8, *N.*7.54-9, *I.*1.47-51, *N.*1.25-30. For the thematic significance of the 'foil' see above. For some critical thoughts about the notion 'foil' as such see introduction, pp. 13/4.

7. ἀεθλονικία δὲ μάλιστ' ἀοιδὰν φιλεῖ
'To victory in the Games song belongs best.' φιλεῖ is used here to express the same idea as διψῆι. The unusual, evocative and metaphorical διψῆι is now replaced by the relatively flat and empty verb φιλεῖ (cf. introduction, p. 32). For **φιλέω** relating two inanimate notions, cf. ἡσυχία δὲ φίλει μὲν συμπόσιον, *N.*9.48, 'tranquillity and a symposion belong together.' See further my note on *P.*8.13/4 (p. 491).

The noun **ἀεθλονικία** occurs only *h.l.* It is a compound of the type Ὀλυμπιονίκας, *O.*6.4, etc. (cf. also Ὀλυμπιονίκης, Hdt.5.47, 71, And.4.33, Pl.*R.*465d, Arist.*Rh.*1365ᵃ 25); Ὀλυμπιόνικος, *O.*5.21, etc.; Πυθιονίκας, *P.*9.1 (Hdt.8.47); Πυθιόνικος, *P.*6.5, 8.5. When, however, a compound is chosen to refer to a victory in these games, the second part of the compound is usually -νίκη (Ὀλυμπιονίκη, Antipho Soph.49; Πυθιονίκη, Hld.5.19). The form ὀλυμπιονικ⟨ί⟩ας is conjectured by P. Maas in B.4.17. For the synizesis, cf. ἀέθλων, *O.*3.15, *N.*11.23, *I.*6.48; ἀεθλοφόροις, *O.*7.7.

8. στεφάνων ἀρετᾶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν
'Most favourable attendant on crowns and (deeds) of manliness.' The apposition to ἀοιδάν elaborates upon the thought of victory and song belonging together: song is, so to speak, not only the natural attendant on victory, but also the most favourable one. By means of τε the στέφανοι and the ἀρεταί are coordinated on the same level. Both substantives have the same object of reference: they are both typical aspects of a victory. For ἀρετά see my note on *N.*5.53 (pp. 188-90).

δεξιός[29] means 'right, i.e., on the right hand.'[30] Since birds flighing in from the right were regarded as a favourable omen, δεξιός gets the connotation 'favourable.'

Cf. ὣς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέπτατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις, | αἰετὸς ὑψιπέτης· ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχε

---

[28] Bundy discusses instances like this in *Studia Pindarica* I p. 7, with n. 23. This passage is mentioned on p. 10 and 11. The 'summary priamel' is the priamel for the man in a hurry, as a very learned man acutely remarked.

[29] The superlative is also attested in Ar.*Nu.*148.

[30] Cf. δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα πατρός, *fr.*146.2; σύ τοι σχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, *P.*6.19; cf. also *P.*4.35, etc.

λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν | θάρσυνος οἰωνῶι, *Il.*13.821-3; (αἰετὸς) εἴσατο δέ σφιν | δεξιὸς ἀΐξας διὰ ἄστεος· οἳ δὲ ἰδόντες | γήθησαν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη, *Il.*24.319-21; cf. also *Od.*2.154, A.*Pr.*489. Metaphorically of other omens: ξύμβολα, ... | δεξιὰ μὲν κατάμομφα δὲ φάσματα,[31] A.*Ag.*144/5; βροντὴ δεξιὰ ἐφθέγξατο· ὁ δ' εἶπεν· ἑξόμεθά σοι, ὦ Ζεῦ μέγιστε, X.*Cyr.*7.1.3.

In αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις | Φυλακίδαι πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι, | χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόωι ἀντίπαλον, *I.*5.59-61, δεξιός is used metaphorically in the sense of 'dexterous'; this connotation is evoked by the context (χερσί). One gets the impression that in 5th/4th century Athens δεξιός came to be a vogue word for 'dexterous, clever' men, cf. ἄνδρας δεξιοὺς | καὶ νοῦν ἔχοντας, Ar.*Nu.*834/5; ῥᾶιον δ' οἱ πολλοὶ κακοῦργοι ὄντες δεξιοὶ κέκληνται ἢ ἀμαθεῖς ἀγαθοί, καὶ τῶι μὲν αἰσχύνονται, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶι ἀγάλλονται, Th.3.82.7; etc. This is especially true for the noun and the adverb: ὑπό γε δεξιότητος τῆς ἐμῆς | δύναμαι ποιεῖν τὸν δῆμον εὐρὺν καὶ στενόν, Ar.*Eq.*719/20, and Th.3.37, where ἀμαθία μετὰ σωφροσύνης is opposed to δεξιότης μετὰ ἀκολασίας. In the opening scene of the *Thesmophoriazusae* Mnesilochus characterizes Euripides' paradoxical way of expressing himself as δεξιῶς (5-10).

The adjective must be used metaphorically here, in the sense of 'favourable.' The suggestion is that crowns and accomplishments in some way profit by being sung about. Song assists in spreading the fame and glory won by them. The connotations with the future evoked by δεξιωτάταν are to be seen in the light of passages like: εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνωι τις εὖ πράσσοι, μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι | ὑστέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων | τέλλεται καὶ πιστὸν ὅρκιον μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς, *O.*11.4-6, where hymns are the starting point of the victor's *fama*, which has also a posthumus dimension to it, since the songs are meant to survive the victor they celebrate (cf. ἁ δ' ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς | χρονία τελέθει, *P.*3.114/5; *O.*8.77-80, etc.). As an additional explanation Bury's observation (p. 46) may hold true: "it suggests that song, the companion, walks on the right of victory. ἀεθλονικία and ἀοιδά are abstractions; ὀπαδόν suggests a concrete picture, and δεξιωτάταν helps to define it."

The interpretation 'most skilful' has been proposed for *h.l.* by Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 15/6: "implying the ingenuity of the poet as the following lines make clear: much thought has gone into its creation (9), it is acceptable to Zeus himself (10-11),[32] it is a complex creation involving ὄαροι and λύρα and αὐλός (79), its creation is a πόνος (12), but the end result will be something the land of Aegina will delight in."[33] (thus also in his *Selected Odes*, p. 155). A problem with this interpretation is that lines 6-

---

[31] The mss. have στρουθῶν after φάσματα. This has been unmasked as a gloss by Porson (cf. *Il.*2.311 ff.).

[32] I interpret lines 10/1 differently. See below.

[33] For Instone's and my interpretation of 12/3 see below.

8 are generic: song in general is the δεξιωτάτα ὀπαδός, not the current ode specifically. Moreover, δέξιος in the sense of 'clever' usually qualifies human beings; here, too, the skill would be the poet's rather than a quality of the poem.

For **ὀπαδός**, 'attendant,'[34] ὦ Πάν, ... Ματρὸς μεγάλας ὀπαδέ, *fr.*95.1-3; cf. also *fr.dub.*335.7; quite frequent in tragedy: τέκνων ὀπαδὲ πρέσβυ, E.*Med.*53, of the παιδαγωγός; E.*Alc.*136, A.*Supp.*985; S.*Tr.*1264, S.*OC* 1091-4; cf. also ἐγὼ Μούσῃσιν ὀπηδός, *h.Merc.*450; Theoc.2.166. The word used by Homer to refer to attendants, 'comrades in war', is ὀπάων (*Il.*8.263, 10.58, 23.360, etc.), which is used once by Pindar (*P.*9.64), Bacchylides (17.35), and a few times in tragedy (A.*Ch.*769, *Supp.*492, 954, S.*Ant.*1108).

Antistrophe A

9. τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε μήτιος ἁμᾶς ἄπο[35]

'Provide abundance of it (*sc.* song) from my skill.' At first sight, there seems to be something contradictory in this entreaty. For a modern reader a song originates either from the Muse or from the poet's mind. Pindar characterizes his poetry as originating both from his own intellect and from a divine source also in: καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις | ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, | ἱλάσκομαι, | Ὀλυμπίαι Πυθοῖ τε νικώντεσσιν, *O.*7.7-10, where, like *h.l.*, poetry is presented as a joint product of the Muses and the poet's intellect. In ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, | ὅ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι | γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας, *N.*4.6-8, good poetry, speech that outlives the deeds it celebrates, is characterized as originating from the poet's intellect and coming to be while the Graces are present.[36]

In general, Pindar acknowledges the indispensability of both divine assistance and his own poetical intellect for the composition of his odes. The divine factor is represented by the Muses (e.g. *P.*1.58), the Graces (e.g. *N.*9.54), or a not further specified θεός or δαίμων.[37] Pindar often refers to the intellectual component of composing poetry by associating his products, or himself, with σοφία (*O.*1.116, 9,38, *P.*1.12, 4.248, 6.49, *N.*7.23, *I.*7.18), or with the qualification σοφός (*O.*1.9, *P.*3.113, 9.78, 10.22, *I.*1.45,

---

[34] The attendant is, of course, female here, since ἀοιδά is female.

[35] The separate words will be commented upon in separate notes below.

[36] For the phrase σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι, see my note on *N.*5.48.

[37] At least to the extent that θεός or a δαίμων is responsible for human abilities in general: ἀγαθοὶ δὲ καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμον' ἄνδρες | ἐγένοντ', *O.*9.27/8; ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ σοφαῖς ἀνθεῖ πραπίδεσσιν ὁμοίως, *O.*11.10.

8.47, *fr.*35b, 52s).[38] Cf. also phrases like τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὖτε φρενὸς ὀϊστοὺς ἱέντες; *O.*2.89/90. Cf. also μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ, *fr.*150, which suggests a particular division of roles between poet and Muse.

This seemingly contradictory double attribution in one and the same passage to some extent mirrors the portrayal of the ἀοιδός Phemius in the *Odyssey*, who claims: αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἴμας | παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, *Od.*22.347/8.

To some extent Phemius' claim is easier to rationalize for a modern reader than Pindar's entreaty here, since Phemius confines the influence of the divine to the οἶμαι he knows. The οἶμαι, the 'paths of song,' are the stories in their rough forms which the singer has at his disposal. Knowledge of an οἴμη consists in knowledge of the subsequent facts that constitute a tale. An οἴμη is indeed a 'path' past the fixed points that have to be mentioned in order to get the story right. In this respect the οἶμαι are the singer's repertoir. When he gives a performance he (or his audience) chooses one οἴμη, one 'story, in its rough form,' and converts it into poetry on the very spot. This concurs with the fact that the Muses are often invoked as an authority guaranteeing the *truth* of a story. They are, so to speak, responsible for the poet knowing the facts, knowing the οἴμη. Thus one may rationalize Phemius' claim by holding the ἀοιδός himself responsible for the conversion of his 'divine' knowledge of stories into poetry.

Something similar may be the case with Demodocus: καλέσασθε δὲ θεῖον ἀοιδὸν | Δημόδοκον· τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδὴν | τέρπειν, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν ἀείδειν, *Od.*8.43-5. This must be taken as the θεός having provided Demodocus with a repertoire, from which the poet at the spot selects what is most fitting to the occasion.

It is interesting to compare also the claim by an anonymous Kirghiz minstrel, quoted by Dodds (p. 23, n. 63) from Chadwick (*Growth of Literature*, III, p. 182) from Radloff: "I can sing any song whatever, for God has implanted this gift of song in my heart. He gives the words on my tongue without my having to seek them. I have learned none of my songs. All springs from my inner self."

But perhaps we are not to rationalize these expressions. As for *h.l.*, the phrasing may just mirror some kind of unspecific awareness of the indispensibility of both technical skill and divine inspiration, without bothering to tell both apart; or, alternatively, it may suggest that the Muse is asked to supply abundant material from which the poet will select and choose by means of his skills.

• *Literature:* On Pindar's conceptions of poetry in general and the intellectual component in particular, see *i.a.* Gundert; Norwood, *Pindar*, 165-9;

---

[38] The significance of σοφός and σοφία in connection with poetry has been examined in some detail by Gianotti, *Poetica Pindarica*, 85-109.

Svoboda, *Aegyptus* 32, 1952, 108-120; Maehler, *Dichterberuf*, 81-101 (esp. 94); Bowra, *Pindar*, 1-41 (esp. 4-8). On the 'double attribution' see especially: Chadwick, *Growth of Literature*, III, p. 182; Dodds, *Greeks & the Irrational*, pp. 1-27, 64-101; Guthrie, *History of Greek Philosophy*, I, p. 415; R. Harriott, *Poetry and Criticism before Plato*, London 1969, 95 (cf. pp. 52-77); W. Krantz, 'Sphragis', *RhM* 104, 1961, 4; MacKay, *The Wrath of Homer*, p. 50; Walsh, *Varieties of Enchantment*, pp. 11-3; E.N. Tigerstedt, '*Furor Poeticus:* Poetic Inspiration in Greek Literature before Democritus and Plato', *JHI* 31, 1970, 168.

9. τᾶϲ ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε

In lines 6-8 Pindar has made clear that a song is needed on this moment, and now he asks the Muse to give 'abundance' of it. τᾶϲ picks up ἀοιδάν, including what has been associated with it (ϲτεφάνων ἀρετᾶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν).

The noun occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. Pindar does use the adjectives ἄφθονοϲ and ἀφθόνητοϲ. These adjectives, formally dissociating φθόνοϲ from the notion they qualify, often serve as a litotes: 'not withholding', 'giving freely', as in ἄνδρα μᾶλλον | εὐεργέταν πραπίϲιν ἀφθονέϲτερόν τε χέρα | Θήρωνοϲ, *O.*2.93-5, and especially 'not withheld', i.e. 'plentiful, abundant', cf. ἀφθόνητοϲ δ' αἶνοϲ 'Ολυμπιονίκαιϲ | οὗτοϲ ἄγκειται, *O.*11.7/ 8[39]; δείπνου δὲ λήγοντοϲ γλυκὺ τρωγάλιον | καίπερ πεδ' ἄφθονον βοράν, *fr.*124c. The noun ἀφθονία is often used in this way by later authors, cf. e.g. Lys.2.2, 12.2, Pl.*Ap.*23c, Men.*fr.*623 (Koerte).

The usage of the verb **ὀπάζω** can be classified into two main categories: non-causative, 'follow', and causative, 'make to follow'. The former is always used with negative connotations ('press hard, chase,' cf. *Il.*8.341, 103, 5.334). When causative, it can be used with personal objects ('send with one, give as a companion,' cf. *Il.*13.416, *Il.*24.461, *Od.*15.310, etc.) or with impersonal objects ('give, grant,' cf. *Il.*8.141, *Od.*21.214, *Od.*13.45, Hes.*Th.*420, etc.). Pindar uses the verb exclusively in the way last mentioned, only with positive notions as objects and nearly always with a deity as subject:

κεῖναι (*sc.* the Graces) γὰρ ὤπαϲαν τὰ τέρπν', *O.*9.28; τάν ποτε Ζεὺϲ ὤπαϲεν λαγέται | Αἰόλωι καὶ παιϲὶ τιμάν, *P.*4.107/8; νίκαν, | τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποϲειδάων ὀπάϲαιϲ, *I.*2.13/4; *O.*6.65, 8.84, 13.14, *P.*8.65, *N.*1.16, 9.30, *I.*4.26,

---

[39] 'Αφθόνητοϲ here is, to my mind correctly, interpreted as 'ungrudging, abundant' by Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, I pp. 14/5, followed by Verdenius (II p. 89). The more traditional interpretation ('beyond the reach of envy', Σ.*ad loc.*, Boeckh, Gildersleeve, LSJ, Fennel, Sandys, Puech, Viljoen, and recently G.M. Kirkwood, in *Greek Poetry and Philosophy* [ed. Gerber], 177), locating the φθόνοϲ on the part of the public, is quite the opposite of the current Pindaric idea that the greater a man's success, the more he risks to be envied (see e.g. *O.*6.74-6, *P.*2.79/80, *P.*7.15, *P.*11.29, *I.*2.43, etc.).

7.38. The only instance where a mortal is subject is: Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν | ἔργοις ὀπάζων, *I.*6.66/7.

For the verb with an object referring to song, cf. ὥς ἄρα τοι πρόφρων θεὸς ὤπασε θέσπιν ἀοιδήν, *Od.*8.498, of Demodocus. The imperative is not uncommon in the envois of rhapsodic hymns (cf. χάριν δ' ἅμ' ὄπασσον ἀοιδῆι, *h.Hom.*24.5; cf. also 2.494, 30.18, 31.17).

•*Aspect:* The present tense stem form mirrors the pragmatic function of the verb. τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε is analogous to 'give a good song' and the content of this entreaty has been implied before.[40] The a play of words with ὀπαδός in the preceding line is constitutive of a semantic link between 7/8 and 9. 'Song is the most favourable companion of victory, so abundance of that must now be the companion.'

9. μήτιος ἁμᾶς ἄπο

μῆτις refers to Pindar's technical skill as a poet. The closest parallel to this is *Il.*23.313-22, where μῆτις is used to refer to the special technical know-how of a wood-cutter, a steersman, and a chariot-driver. In its evoking strong connotations of skill, the reference to the poet's μῆτις is more specific than the reference to his φρήν in ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, | ὅ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι | γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας, *N.*4.6-8, and καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις | ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, | ἱλάσκομαι, | Ὀλυμπίαι Πυθοῖ τε νικώντεσσιν, *O.*7.7-10. For a semantic analysis of μῆτις in Homer and Pindar, see appendix, pp. 613-6. For **ἁμός** / ἁμέτερος used as an equivalent of a singular (ἐμός), see my note on line 1. μᾶτερ ἁμετέρα. See also Braswell on *P.*4.27(e).

10-12

Begin, daughter of the lord of the many-clouded heaven, a quality hymn. I shall share it with their chat and the lyre.

10-12

Cf. Μῶσ' ἄγε Καλλιόπα, θύγατερ Διός, | ἄρχ' ἐρατῶν ϝεπέων, ἐπὶ δ' ἵμερον | ὕμνωι καὶ χαρίεντα τίθη χορόν, Alcm.*fr.*27 Da. Whereas Alcman asks the Muse to endow his hymn with longing (i.e., make it

---

[40] See Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 157: "In particular, PS is the obvious choice for an imperative when there can be no doubt as to *what* action the person addresses is supposed to be taking—wheter 1) because this action has been mentioned or implied earlier or 2) because he is already performing it—and the imperative serves to ask him or her either to continue or to stop doing so." This would be an example of the first situation; cf. Sicking's examples 72-76 (pp. 157-9).

lovely) and render the chorus charming,[41] Pindar emphatically claims that it is his own responsibility to make the hymn, once provided by the Muse, 'common' to the chorus.

10. ἄρχε

In post-Homeric Greek, active ἄρχω is quite rare in the sense of 'beginning'; an accusative object with the verb in this sense is even less usual.

In Homer ἄρχω is more common in the active than in the middle. Active ἄρχω, when used abolutely, refers to 'leading the way' (*Il.*1.495, etc.). With an accusative, it is used in the same sense; the accusative makes explicit what way, the person who is being led is referred to in the dative (cf. ἄρχε δὲ τῶι αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἥν περ οἱ ἄλλοι | Φαιήκων οἱ ἄριστοι, *Od.*8.107/8, etc.). With a genitive object the verb means 'beginning', both in the active (*Il.*7.232, etc.) and in the middle (*Od.*6.101, etc.); in Homer it is not always easy to detect any semantic differentiation between the active and middle, but some passages seem to justify the assumption that active ἄρχω emphatically implies that others are to continue, whereas the middle is more neutral in this respect (contrast, e.g., ἦρχον ἐγὼ μύθοιο, κελεύων ὔμμ' ἅμ' ἕπεσθαι· | cφὼ δὲ μάλ' ἠθέλετον, τὼ δ' ἄμφω πόλλ' ἐπέτελλον, *Il.*11.781/2, with τοῖcιν δ' Ἀρήτη λευκώλενος ἄρχετο μύθων, *Od.*7.233).

In post-Homeric Greek, the distribution of active ἄρχω and middle ἄρχομαι with a genitive object has got lexicalized to a high extent, referring to 'ruling' (esp. when the genitive refers to places or peoples, as in Hdt.5.1, etc., but cf. also *P.*4.230) and 'beginning' (in most other cases, cf. *P.*4.30, *N.*5.25, etc.) respectively. Yet there are, also after Homer, some cases of active ἄρχω in the sense of 'beginning' with a genitive. Here, too, the active seems to be used in order to emphasize that the one who starts off a process or chain of events does not himself continue it. As an effect, the active focusses upon responsibility for a chain of events, whereas the middle is un-marked. Cf., e.g., ἦρξεν μέν, ὦ δέcποινα, τοῦ παντὸc κακοῦ | φανεὶc ἀλάcτωρ ἢ κακὸc δαίμων ποθέν, A.*Pers.*353/4; ἦρξε δ' ἐμβολῆc Ἑλληνικὴ | ναῦc *ibid.*409/10; δοκεῖ δέ μοι περὶ τὸν ἄρξαντα τῆc πληγῆc τὸ ἀδίκημα εἶναι, Antipho 4.2, 'it is with the aggressor that the blame for the deed rests' (transl. Maidment). LSJ may be right to contrast: ἀδικεῖτε ... πολέμου ἄρχοντεc καὶ cπονδὰc λύοντεc. ... εἰ δὲ ὑμῖν γνώμη ἐcτὶ κωλύειν τε ἡμᾶc ἐπὶ Κέρκυραν ἢ ἄλλοcε εἴ ποι βουλόμεθα πλεῖν καὶ τὰc cπονδὰc λύετε, ἡμᾶc τούcδε λαβόντεc πρῶτον χρήcαcθε ὡc πολεμίοιc, Th.1.53, 'start the war, be the aggressor', with εἰ δὲ ἄρα ἐκ θεῶν πεπρωμένον ἐcτὶ πολέμουc ἐν ἀνθρώποιc γίγνεcθαι, ἡμᾶc δὲ χρὴ ἄρχεcθαι μὲν αὐτοῦ ὡc

[41] For the zeugmatic use of τίθημι cf. *P.*1.40. See also my note on line 22 below (pp. 292/3).

cχολαίτατα, ὅταν δὲ γένηται, καταλύεcθαι ἧι δύνατον τάχιcτα, X.*HG* 6.3.6, 'begin our operations, get involved'.

For active ἄρχω with an accusative in the sense of 'beginning', cf. ἐρεῖc μὲν οὐχὶ νῦν γέ μ' ὡc ἄρξαcά τι | λυπηρόν, S.*El.*552/3; θεοὶ γὰρ οὔποτ', εἴ τι χρὴ βροτὸν λέγειν, | ἄρξαcι Φρυξὶ τὴν κατ' Ἀργείουc ὕβριν | ξυναινέcονται· ταῦτα μὴ μάχου βίαι, S.*fr.*368; ξιφοδηλήτωι | θανάτωι τείcαc ἅπερ ἦρξεν, A.*Ag.*1528/9 (if the unanimous mss. reading is kept; Spanheim conjectured ἔρξεν, adopted by Fraenkel, but see also Denniston and Page). These passages have in common that ἄρχω refers to 'starting off' a process or a chain of events, with the connotation of being responsible for the chain of events by virtue of having started it while not necessarily being in control of every single event that resulted from the initial action. This connotation could be relevant to our passage, to the extent that the Muse is only partly responsible to the ode's coming to be; after she has, in one way or the other, started the process, the poet is going to take over, as he says in the next sentence (11/2). Our passage differs from the three parallels cited in that the accusative object here refers to something positive.

Pindar's choice of an accusative object instead of a genitive here can be understood by taking into account the ambiguity that might have ensued from the use of the genitive in this particular case: δοκίμου ὕμνου could perhaps have been misinterpreted as a genitive adjunct to θύγατερ; the close vicinity of the other genitive noun phrase, οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα, would have resulted in additional ambiguities.

•*Aspect:* The present seems idiomatic for the imperative in this sense. ἄρξον is found only once: ἄγε Μοῦcα λίγει' ἄρξον ἀοιδᾶc †ἐρατῶν ὕμνουc† | Cαμίων περὶ παίδων ἐρατᾶι φθεγγομένα λύραι, Stesich.*fr.*278 Da.

10. οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ

The Muse is called upon as the 'daughter of the lord of the many-clouded heaven,' i.e., as a daughter of Zeus. οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι is an attributive adjunct to θύγατερ.

• *Text:* There is some discrepancy between the readings of the various mss. and the ancient commentators: D reads οὐρανῶι πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ, which entails that the Muse is the 'cloudy daughter of lord Uranus'; B reads οὐρανῶ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ, which is explained as an Aeolic form by Σ. 16a (III 43 Dr.: Αἰολικῶc ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; this scholion is found in both cod. B and D); V reads οὐρανώα πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ, giving a metrically dubious form otherwise unattested. From the scholion *ad loc.*[42] it

[42] Σ. 16b (III 43/4 Dr.): ὁ μὲν Ἀρίcταρχοc Οὐρανοῦ θυγατέρα τὴν Μοῦcαν δέδεκται, καθάπερ Μίμνερμοc (*fr.*13) καὶ Ἀλκμὰν (*fr.*119) ἱcτοροῦcιν· ὁ δὲ Ἀμμώνιοc

appears that Ammonius and Aristarchus read Οὐρανῶι πολυνεφέλαι κρέοντι θύγατερ, 'daughter of the cloudy lord Uranus' and that Didymus reads οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλαι κρέοντι θύγατερ, 'daughter of the cloudy lord of heaven'.

Furthermore, modern commentators disagree as to the syntactic function of οὐρανῶ(ι)/-οῦ πολυνεφέλα(ι) κρέοντι. Most take it as a qualification of δόκιμον ὕμνον (11), as is suggested by the interpunction of Snell-Maehler, who do not punctuate after δ' and put a comma after κρέοντι and θύγατερ.[43] It is true that the Muses always start their songs with Zeus (see my note on *N.*5.25, pp. 142/3); and it is true that line 65 will explicitly connect this victory ode with Zeus. However, as Bergk has rightly objected, the Muse cannot be called just θύγατερ, without any qualification indicating whose daughter she is (the less so since she is called upon as μᾶτερ ἁμετέρα in line 1). Moreover, it is not a hymn for Zeus that the Muse is asked to begin with, but an epinicion for Aristoclides.[44]

So οὐρανῶ(ι)/-οῦ πολυνεφέλα(ι) κρέοντι must be a qualification of θύγατερ. This being so οὐρανῶ(ι)/-οῦ πολυνεφέλα(ι) κρέοντι must be a circumscription of Zeus (cf. *Pae.*6.56), which rules out οὐρανῶι in the dative. The Aeolic genitive οὐρανῶ, read by B and explained in the scholion, is to be rejected in favour of the regular οὐρανοῦ.

What Pindar himself wrote was probably OPANO, and the interpretation ōρανō is secured by the metre. Whether a modern editor prefers to spell this as οὐρανοῦ or οὐρανῶ is, in principle, immaterial. The unanimous manuscriptual tradition in favour of οὐρανῶ[45] only points to an autograph OPANO and has no further value as an argument. So it is a matter of consistency. If we decide to spell οὐρανοῦ in *N.*4.67, *N.*5.34, *N.*10.88, and *I.*7.45, we should spell οὐρανοῦ here.[46]

προστίθησιν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο κρέοντα κέκληκε τὸν Οὐρανόν, ὅτι πρὶν Κρόνον βασιλεῦσαι οὗτος ἐβασίλευσεν. ἤλλακται δὲ ἡ πτῶσις, ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦ πολυνεφέλου οὐρανοῦ θύγατερ. βέλτιον δέ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος ἀκούειν τὸ ὅλον οὕτως· τοῦ πολυνεφέλου κρέοντος οὐρανοῦ θύγατερ, τοῦ Διός, κρέων γὰρ οὐρανοῦ ὁ Ζεύς, Διὸς δὲ Μοῦσαι.

[43] Thus also Dissen ("praei vero caeli regi praeclarum hymnum, filia [= filia Jovis]"), Fennell (paraphrasing ἄρχε ὕμνον Διί), Bury ("begin a true hymn in honour of the king of the cloudy welkin, his daughter thou"), Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 273.

[44] Bergk (I p. 194): "At neque θύγατερ sic nude dici poterat, neque ἄρχε ὕμνον Διΐ cum totius loci instituto convenit. Multo rectius veteres grammatici κρέοντι cum voce θύγατερ iunxerunt." Indeed, all ancient commentators quoted in the Σ.*ad h.l.*, Aristarchus, Ammonius, and Didymus (*v.s.*), take the three words as a qualification of θύγατερ. Cf. also Instone *ad loc.* (*Selected Odes*, p. 156).

[45] Strictly spoken οὐρανοῦ has no direct manuscriptual authority, for the scholiast paraphrases Didymus' interpretation in normalized Attic.

[46] Naturally, the argument of consistency used here does not apply to those cases where Pindar himself could have made the difference in writing (as e.g. with μιν and νιν, see my note on *N.*5.31, pp. 154/5, and with κοινώσομαι and κοινάσαντες, see my note on 11/2 below).

The only uncertainty remaining is whether πολυνεφέλα (genitive, not vocative, for the Muse is not 'cloudy') ought to be read, or πολυνεφέλαι. The adjective occurs only here (πολυνέφελος is attested in *EM* 7.10). This epithet is fitting both for the heavens and for Zeus (other epithets for Zeus associating him with clouds are: ὑψινεφής, *O.*5.17, ὀρσινεφής, *N.*5.34, and κελαινεφής, *Pae.*6.55, 12.9; these are all, of course, reminiscent of the Homeric formula νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς [*Il.*1.517, al.]). However, the evidence from the mss. is clearly in favour of πολυνεφέλα, for there would be no reason at all for a scribe to alter πολυνεφέλαι into πολυνεφέλα, especially in the case of D, reading οὐρανῶι, while the corruption the other way around (as occurring in Aristarchus, Ammonius, and Didymus) can easily be accounted for.[47]

For θυγάτηρ qualified by a dative, cf. Θέμις θυγάτηρ τέ οἱ ... | ... Εὐνομία, *O.*9.15/6. Cf. also φῶτες Αἰγεΐδαι, | ἐμοὶ πατέρες, *P.*5.75/6; μία βοῦς Κρηθεῖ τε μάτηρ | καὶ θρασυμήδεϊ Σαλμωνεῖ, *P.*4.142/3. For other examples of a dative qualifying a noun, see Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 128 (§ 133).

With this interpretation one is to punctuate ἄρχε δ', οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ, | δόκιμον ὕμνον.

11. δόκιμον ὕμνον

δόκιμος (only *h.l.* in Pindar) means 'approved', 'that passes the test.'[48] The adjective may, e.g., qualify ἀργύριον, denoting that it is 'legal' (D.35.24, Lucian.(70)*Hermot.*68). What has such quality that it would 'pass the test,' is 'held in high esteem.' In Δωριέων μὲν πολλαί τε καὶ δόκιμοι πόλιες, Αἰτωλῶν δὲ Ἦλις μούνη, Hdt.8.73, the adjective may be translated with 'esteemed, important,' as also in: ὥστε ὦν ποταμῶν ἐς αὐτὴν καὶ ἄλλων συχνῶν ἐσβαλλόντων, πέντε δὲ τῶν δοκίμων μάλιστα τῶνδε, Hdt.7.129.

When qualifying persons, the adjective denotes that a man 'would pass the test.' The field to which this applies may be specified by an infinitive clause, as in: δόκιμος δ' οὔτις ὑποστὰς μεγάλωι ῥεύματι φωτῶν | ἐχυροῖς ἕρκεσιν εἴργειν ἄμαχον κῦμα θαλάσσας· | ἀπρόσοιστος γὰρ ὁ Περσᾶν στρατὸς

---

[47] Instone *ad loc.* (*Selected Odes*, pp. 155/6) prefers the dative "because it is in Pindar's manner to modify an epic formula." However, also transferring the adjective from the person to his habitat may qualify for Instone's criterium.

[48] The verb δοκιμάζω means to 'test, assay' (Hdt.2.38, Isoc.2.50, 12.39, X.*Mem.*2.6.1, Th.6.53, Arist.*EN* 1118a28, etc.); the context providing the circumstances, it can mean 'approve, sanction' (Th.2.35, 3.38, Pl.*R.*407c, Lys.14.22, 15.6, 16.3, etc.). The noun δοκιμασία is a *terminus technicus* for the 'examination' of magistrates after their election in order to see whether they fulfil the legal requirements for the job (Lys.15.2, 16.9, Pl.*Lg.*759d, Arist.*Ath.*59.4, etc.). Hesychius paraphrazes δόκιμος as χρήσιμος, τέλειος (I p. 470 Latte).

ἀλκίφρων τε λαόϲ, A.*Pers.*86-92, 'there is no man qualified enough to withstand our armies,' or by a dative, as in: τί δ' οὐ cὺ φρονεῖϲ ὁπόϲα χρεὼν ἐϲτιν | τόν ⟨γε⟩ ϲοφῆι δόκιμον φρενὶ | πορίμωι τε τόλμηι; Ar.*Pax* 1029-31 ('esteemed for,' Platnauer, *ad loc.*, p. 153).[49] δόκιμοϲ is one of Herodotus' favourite words to refer to a man's social position. A man who is δόκιμοϲ has 'proved his worth,' which makes him 'respectable' and 'esteemed.' Cf., e.g., Λυκούργου τῶν Cπαρτιητέων δοκίμου ἀνδρὸϲ ἐλθόντοϲ ἐϲ Δελφούϲ, Hdt.1.65; 'Αρταχαίην, δόκιμον ἐόντα παρὰ Ξέρξηι, Hdt.7.117 (cf. also 1.114, 124, 158, 2.162, 181, 3.75, etc.). In ἦν γὰρ Νικόδρομοϲ Κνοίθου καλεόμενοϲ ἐν τῆι Αἰγίνηι ἀνὴρ δόκιμοϲ, Hdt.6.88, Nicodromus ranks as δόκιμοϲ in spite of the fact that he has been banished from Aegina, which gives the impression that δόκιμοϲ refers to a man's social position, his moralily being irrelevant. In Πρηξάϲπηϲ μέν νυν ἐὼν τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἀνὴρ δόκιμοϲ οὕτω ἐτελεύτηϲε, Hdt.3.75, Prexaspes came to his end in a deplorable way, in spite of his having been a respectable man all his life. Cf. also νῦν τιϲ ἄνηρ δόκιμοϲ γε[νέϲθω] | καὶ μὴ καταιϲύνωμεν ⏑–⏑× | ἔϲλοιϲ τόκηαϲ, Alc.*fr.*6.12-4 V.; ὦ φίλοϲ, ὦ δοκιμώτατοϲ 'Ελλάδι, E.*Supp.*278, i.e Theseus; εἶναι δὲ καὶ δοκίμων ἀνδρῶν βίουϲ, τοὺϲ μὲν ἐπὶ εἴδεϲιν καὶ κατὰ κάλλη καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἰϲχύν τε καὶ ἀγωνίαν, τοὺϲ δ' ἐπὶ γένεϲιν καὶ προγόνων ἀρεταῖϲ, καὶ ἀδοκίμων κατὰ ταῦτα, ὡϲαύτωϲ δὲ καὶ γυναικῶν, Pl.*R.*618a.

So here Pindar is entreating the Muse to start with a hymn 'that passes the test,' a 'quality hymn.'

There is one passage where the adjective is possibly used to qualify 'hymns' too: ϲέβομαι Λατώ τ' ἄναϲϲαν | κίθαρίν τε ματέρ' ὕμνων | ἄρϲενι βοᾶι δοκίμων, Ar.*Thesm.*122-4. Unfortunately δοκίμων is Meineke's conjecture for the mss.-reading δοκίμωι[50]; Dindorf suggested δόκιμον.[51]

11-12. ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ μιν ὀάροιϲ | λύραι τε κοινώϲομαι

Now the poet switches to his own role. He promises that, when the Muse provides her song, he will 'make his hymn (μιν) common to the voices of the μελιγαρύων τέκτονεϲ κώμων νεανίαι and to the lyre' (11/2).

• *Semantics:* The **ὄαροι** are a metaphor for the praise sung by the boys' chorus. The verb ὀαρίζω means to 'chat', with the connotation of talking in a relaxed an friendly way (cf. esp. *Il.*22.126-8; cf. also *Il.*6.516, *h.Merc.*170-2, *h.Hom.*23.1-3). The nouns ὀαριϲτύϲ and ὄαροϲ denote familiar and friendly 'chat.'

---

[49] This usage with the dative excludes Instone's interpretation for our passage, who takes δόκιμον with κρέοντι in the sense of 'a song that is acceptable to Zeus' (*ad loc.*, *Selected Odes*, pp. 155/6).

[50] The dative is confirmed by the scholia *ad loc.* (ἄρϲενι βοᾶι δοκίμωι, ἐπεὶ 'Απόλλων ἐϲτὶν ὁ κιθαρίζων, and: τῆι θαυμαϲτῆι φωνῆι καὶ δεδοκιμαϲμένηι).

[51] The adjective has two endings, cf. Hdt.8.73.

Cf. ἔνθ' ἔνι μὲν φιλότης, ἐν δ' ἵμερος, ἐν δ' ὀαριστύς, | πάρφασις[52], ἥ τ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονεόντων, *Il.*14.216/7, where 'chatting friendly' is one of the ingredients of Aphrodite's cestus containing a set of instruments for seduction; cf also παρθενίους τ' ὀάρους μειδήματά τ' ἐξαπάτας τε | τέρψιν τε γλυκερὴν φιλότητά τε μειλιχίην τε, Hes.*Th.*205/6; οἳ πρὶν ἐμοὺς ὀάρους καὶ μήτιας, αἷς ποτε πάντας | ἀθανάτους συνέμιχα καταθνητῇσι γυναιξί, | τάρβεσκον, *h.Ven.*249-51, where Aphrodite is speaking. Cf. also the simplified definition given by Pl.*Min.*319e: οἱ γὰρ ὄαροι λόγοι εἰσίν, καὶ ὀαριστὴς συνουσιαστής ἐστιν ἐν λόγοις.

Pindar uses the noun twice in this way: πραῢν δ' Ἰάσων | μαλθακᾶι φωνᾶι ποτιστάζων ὄαρον | βάλλετο κρηπῖδα σοφῶν ἐπέων, *P.*4.136-8; μαθὼν δέ τις ἀνερεῖ, | εἰ πὰρ μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρον ἐννέπων, *N.*7.68/9. Here the noun is used as a metaphor for the praise sung by the boys' chorus, as in τὸν δὲ ... | ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾶι φάτις, | οὐδέ μιν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφιαι κοινωνίαν[53] | μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροισι δέκονται, *P.*1.95-8. The denotation 'chat,' i.e., conversation of an unofficial character, is excluded in favour of the connotation 'friendly and becoming utterance.'

κείνων must refer to μελιγαρύων τέκτονες | κώμων νεανίαι in lines 4/5. However, the audience will only be able to recognize this when they has heard ὀάροις. This reference is part of a quite complex presentation strategy. What we have here is a chorus singing an ode, the performance of which is being placed in the future (see note on 12. κοινάσομαι); they are singing it in the *persona* of the poet, referring to themselves by means of a third person pronoun. The antecedent of **μιν** is δόκιμον ὕμνον. For μιν and νιν with non-personal antecedent, cf. *O.*3.45, *P.*2.57, *P.*4.242, *P.*12.22; cf. also *P.*8.16 with my note (p. 495). It is preferable to keep the mss.-reading; see my note on *N.*5.31 μιν (pp. 154/5).

λύρα: "The defining features of a lyre are that it has two arms projecting from the body and linked by a crossbar or yoke; the strings extend from the crossbar over an open space and then over a bridge on the front soundboard to a fastening at the base. In Greek lyres the strings are of equal length," West, *Ancient Greek Music*, 48/9. The noun λύρα does not occur in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*.[54] The earliest

---

[52] Cf. the common association between love and Πειθώ, e.g. *P.*9.39, perhaps Sapph.1.18, etc. See also comm. *ad N.*5.32 παρφαμένα.

[53] For the orthography of this noun *v.i.*, comm. *ad* 12. κοινάσομαι.

[54] In Homer only two string-instruments are mentioned, the φόρμιγξ and the κίθαρις, and probably both words are used to refer to the same instrument (cf. φόρμιγγι κιθάριζε, *Il.*18.570; κῆρυξ δ' ἐν χερσὶν κίθαριν περικαλλέα θῆκε | ... | ἤτοι ὁ φορμίζων κτλ, *Od.*1.153-5). Homer describes this instrument as having a ζυγόν (*Il.*9.187), i.e. the cross-bar joining the two horns, κόλλοπες, screws by which the strings were tuned (*Od.*21.407), χορδαί, strings of sheep's gut (*Od.*21.408), and a

occurences are Margites 1.3 and *h.Merc.*423.[55] In general "antiquity has left us no specifications detailed enough to serve as evidence for assigning the names λύρα, κιθάρα, βάρβιτος to the different lyres we see on pots" (Steinmayer, p. 110). Furthermore, the word φόρμιγξ almost completely disappears by the fifth century as a non-poetical term for the short-armed lyre. This leads one to the suspicion that the words λύρα and φόρμιγξ were used to refer to the same intsrument. In spite of this diffusion and overlap with respect to the nomenclature, West (p. 50) has attempted to arrive at a qualification of the different types of lyres. For him a φόρμιγξ is a round-based box lyre, while a κιθάρα is a box lyre which may be round-based, square-based, or rectangular; a λύρα is a bowl lyre, having a sound box made out of a tortoise shell; a βάρβιτος is a long-armed bowl lyre.

Pindar uses the λύρα (*h.l.*, *locc. citt.* [*v.i.*], *O.*10.93, *P.*10.39, *N.*11.7 [*fr.*215.9?]) as well as the κίθαρις (*P.*5.65, *Pae.*12d.2) and the φόρμιγξ (*O.*1.17, 3.8, 7.12, *P.*1.1, 97, 2.70/1, 4.296, *N.*4.5, 44, 5.24, 9.8, *I.*2.2, 5.27, *fr.*129.7, 140a.61)[56]—or at least he uses the words for it. In *fr.*124d there is a possible reference to the βάρβιτος. See also my note on *N.*5.24 (pp. 137/8). For the combination of a lyre and song, cf. *O.*6.96/7, *O.*2.46/7, *P.*8.29-31, *P.*10.38/9, *N.*11.7. In line 79 below it appears that flutes also accompany this ode (see my note *ad loc.*).

•*Literature:* Cingano on *P.*1.1 (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 327); L. Deubner, 'Die viersaitige Leier', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*, 54, 1929, 194-200; H. Huchzermeyer, *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik*, Diss. Münster 1931; Kollmann on *P.*1.1 (pp. 40-2); S. Michaelides, *The Music of Ancient Greece, An Encylopaedia*, London 1978, 253/4; J. McIntosh Snyder, 'The *Barbitos* in the Classical Period', *CJ* 67, 1971, 331-340; A.J. Neubecker, *Altgriechische Musik. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1977, 70/1; D. Paquette, *L'instrument de musique dans la céramique de la Grèce antique*, Paris 1984, pp. 86 ff., 145 ff.; H. Roberts, 'The Technique of Playing Ancient Greek Instruments of the Lyre Type', *Music and Civilazation, British Museum Yearbook* 4, London 1979, 43-62; O.C. Steinmayer, *A Glossary of Terms Referring to Music in Greek Literature before 400*

sound box (cf. φόρμιγγα γλαφυρήν, *Od.*8.257, 17.262). Homer does not mention a πλῆκτρον.

[55] In this hymn the making of the first lyre by Hermes is described in detail (39-54); however, this same instrument is referred to as a φόρμιγξ in 64 and 507, and as a κίθαρις in 499, 509, and 515 (the act of playing it is called κιθαρίζειν in 423, 433, 455, 475, 476, and 510).

[56] There is, to my mind, no reason to assume with Steinmayer (p. 111) that "Pindar does not mention the λύρα ... in such dignified places as he does the φόρμιγξ".

B.C., Diss. Yale 1985, 109-115; M. Wegner, *Das Musikleben der Griechen*, Berlin 1949, 29/30; M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992, 48-70.

The verb **κοινόω** means 'to make something (acc.) κοινός, common, to something or someone (dat.),' i.e., 'share it with,' 'combine it with.' Often the verb is used with objects referring to plans, proposals, points of view, etc.; then the verb refers to their being shared with others, i.e., to their communication to others, often with the connotation of deliberation.[57]

Cf. τῶι πλήθει τὰ ῥηθέντα κοινώσαντες, Th.2.72; βούλονται ἃ προκαλεῖται Ἀθηναίοις κοινῶσαι πρῶτον, Th.2.73; κοινώσας δὲ τὴν ἐπίνοιαν τοῖς Ἀκαρνᾶσιν, Th.3.95; εἰ δ' ἄλλο πρᾶξαι δεῖ τι βουλιώτερον, | ἀνδρῶν τόδ' ἐστὶν ἔργον, οἷς κοινώσομεν, A.*Ch.*672/3; ἡμεῖς δὲ ταῦτα τοῖς κρατοῦσι δωμάτων | κοινώσομεν, A.*Ch.*716/7; τούτωι (*sc.* Πιτθεῖ) θεοῦ μάντευμα κοινῶσαι θέλω, E.*Med.*685, etc.

In Πλεισθενίδας Μενέλαος γάρυϊ θελξιεπεῖ | φθέγξατ' εὐπέπλοισι κοινώσας Χάρισσιν, B.*Dith.*15.48/9, Menelaos is said to speak in elegant wordings, which is expressed by the assertion that 'he made (his voice, his words) common to the Graces.' In: (Ismene:) δέδρακα τοὔργον, εἴπερ ἥδ' ὁμορροθεῖ, | καὶ ξυμμετίσχω καὶ φέρω τῆς αἰτίας. | (Antigone:) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐάσει τοῦτό γ' ἡ Δίκη σ', ἐπεὶ | οὔτ' ἠθέλησας οὔτ' ἐγὼ 'κοινωσάμην, S.*Ant.*536-9, Antigone denies that she has 'made the deed common to Ismene' (ἐκοινωσάμην, *sc.* τὸ ἔργον σοι; the middle emphatically claims τὸ ἔργον to be Antigone's own ἔργον, with which her sister has nothing to do), i.e., that she has involved her sister in what she did. In οὐκ ἐκοινοῦντο τὸν στόλον ἐς τὴν Χίον ..., ἀλλ' ὕστερον ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν διενοοῦντο ἄλλωι στόλωι πλεῖν, Th.8.8, they did not 'make their (middle) expedition common to the others,' i.e., they did not undertake it together with them. In ἡ κοινουμένη | τὰς συμφοράς σοι πρόσθεν, ἀπολαχοῦσα νῦν | αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτὴν τὴν τύχην οἴσει πικρῶς, E.*Ion* 608-10, before she made her misfortunes common to her husband, i.e., she shared them with him (middle because they are her own misfortunes, or perhaps also: 'to her own advantage, comfort'). Cf. also κρύβδα πέμπον σπαργάνοις ἐν πορφυρέοις, | νυκτὶ κοινάσαντες ὁδόν, *P.*4.114/5, 'making the road common to the night,' making sure it was night before they set off.

---

[57] Especially in the middle ('to make something to one's own advantage common to someone else'), cf. ἄγ'· ὡς φίλωι γὰρ ὄντι σοι κοινώσομαι· | δοκοῦσα μέν τί πρός γε σοῦ πράξειν καλῶς; | ὅμως δ'· ἐρωτηθεὶς γὰρ αἰσχίων φανῇ· | νῦν ποῖ τράπωμαι; E.*Med.*499-502, 'I will (to my own advantage) make the affair common to you as my φίλος', i.e. 'I will ask your advice on this affair'; Ξενοφῶν δὲ ἔτι μὲν ἐπεχείρησεν ἀπαλλαγεὶς τῆς στρατίας ἐκπλεῦσαι· θυομένωι δὲ αὐτῶι τῶι ἡγεμόνι Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ κοινουμένωι, πότερα λῶιον καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη στρατεύεσθαι ἔχοντι τοὺς παραμείναντας τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἢ ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, ἐσήμηνεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἱεροῖς συστρατεύεσθαι, X.*An.*6.2.15.

Pindar states that he will 'make his hymn (μιν) common to the voices of the μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κώμων νεανίαι and to the lyre.' The future maintains the proemial fiction (see the general note, p. 241 above and my *First Person Futures*, pp. 33-43. The middle is to be explained from the fact that the ode is coming form Pindar's own μῆτιc. With ἐγὼ δέ the perspective has switched from the Muse to the poet.

Hubbard, *Phoenix* 41, 1987, 1-9, has proposed to interpret the datives ὀάροιc and λύραι as instrumentals rather than as indirect objects and to translate 'communicate (to the public in such a way as to make it of broadly public concern) by means of lyre and voice' (see esp. pp. 6, 9). This interpretation is untenable because of the valency of the verb κοινόω. The verb goes with both an accusative object and a dative object. If one of these is lacking, it can easily be supplied from the context.[58] If, however, either an accusative, or a dative, or both come into account to be constructed with this verb, it is highly unnatural, not to say impossible, not to do so. Hubbard' interpretation implies the untenable presupposition that a listening audience, arriving at κοινώcομαι after having heard ὀάροιc and λύραι, do not construe these datives with the verb and supply something like τῶι πλήθει (or τῶι λαῶι, or ὑμῖν, or whatsoever), instead.

• *Orthography:* The mss. unanimously read κοινώcομαι. Boeckh suggested to read κοινάcομαι, since this would be the more regular Doric form, as appears from the only other occurance of this verb in Pindar (κοινάcαντεc, *P.*4.115). For the same reason Schroeder suggested to read κοινανίαν in *P.*1.97, where the mss. read κοινωνίαν. It is as a rule not preferable to make Pindar more Doric—if it can be taken for granted that κοινάcομαι and κοινανία are Doric forms[59] —than the manuscripts do. Pindar's dialect is a hybrid. It is preferable to follow the authority of the mss. and read κοινωνίαν in *P.*1.97 and κοινώcομαι *h.l.*

• *Coordination:* From the first line of the poem until this sentence the poet formulated an entreaty to the Muse. Now the poet switches to his own role. The new *topic*, ἐγώ, is typically being referred to in the marked position before **δέ**. The particles **τε ... τε** coordinate two aspects of the performance of an ode: the singing of the chorus and the accompaniment of the lyre. For the position of the first τε, cf. Ἀλκαθόου τ' ἀγών ... | ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι τε, *I.*8.67/8; Μέμνονόc τε βίαν | ὑπέρθυμον Ἕκτορά τ' ἄλλουc τ' ἀριcτεωαc, *I.*8.54/5; Νίcου τ' ἐν λόφωι, *P.*9.90, *N.*5.46, etc.

• *Choral or solo performance:* For the debate see my notes on the Proem and on lines 4/5 above (pp. 242, 249). Those advocating the hypothesis that Pindar's victory ode were composed to be sung as solos, have attempted two different ways of avoiding the conclusion that Pindar here

---

[58] For the direct object lacking, cf. A.*Ch.*673, B.*Dyth.*15.49, E.*Med.*499 (*v.s.*); for the indirect object lacking, cf. Th.8.8 (*v.s.*); for both lacking, cf. S.*Ant.*539.

[59] For the future of the verb this form is not attested. The noun κοινανία is attested only in Aesar. *ap.* Stob.1.48.6.

says that this ode is sung by a chorus of young men. Lefkowitz, *First Person Fictions*, 199/200, argued that two songs were involved, a hymn to Zeus, for a chorus, who have sung before, or will sing after Pindar's solo performance of *N.*3. This is a misinterpretation of the preceding sentence (10/11), which does not refer to a hymn for Zeus (see my notes above). Heath and Lefkowitz, *CPh* 86, 1991, 186-8, dropped the Zeus hymn, but still argued that two songs were involved: the song that has been sung by the young men in the κῶμος before Pindar's performance of his own ode might be something like the τήνελλα καλλινίκη, or some other song suitable to the occasion. This song would be referred to by ὀάροις in line 11: ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ μιν ὀάροις | λύραι τε κοινώσομαι (11/2) is interpreted by Heath and Lefkowitz as 'I will share my present hymn with the song sung already by the komasts and with my lyre by which I will accompany myself now.' But the phrase 'I shall make my song κοινός to their voices' cannot possibly be interpreted as 'I shall sing a song after they have done so.' And interpreting 'I shall make my song κοινός to their voices and my lyre' as 'I will share my present hymn with the song sung already by the komasts and with my lyre by which I will accompany myself now,' differentiating in the meaning of κοινώσομαι for each of both datives that are so closely associated[60], goes far beyond the acceptable.

12-17

This monument for the country will involve pleasant labour, [the country] where of old the Myrmidons dwelt, whose assembly place of ancient fame Aristoclidas did not sully with disgrace, according to his own destiny, by having become soft in the exceedingly strong expedition of the pancration.

12-13. χαρίεντα δ' ἕξει πόνον | χώρας ἄγαλμα

The subject of ἕξει is χώρας ἄγαλμα, 'the outward show of the country's honour,' referring to the present ode. Setting up this ἄγαλμα 'involves' πόνος on the part of the poet, but the labour involved will be χαρίεις for him, because it is occasioned by a pleasant occasion. For the details see appendix, pp. 616-9.

• *Word-order:* Word-order in this sentence is highly effective. χαρίεντα is given relief by the *hyperbaton* and by having been placed in the marked position before δ'. This emphasizes the point that the poet will gladly undertake the troublesome task. Then, after χαρίεντα, we get the predicate, then πόνον, which makes the object complete. We are still waiting for the subject. First, however, we get a genitive qualifying the still unknown subject. Only with ἄγαλμα

---

[60] Carey, *CPh* 86, 1991, 196/7: "if the lyre is an instrument for the performance of *N.*3, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the voices perform the same role, given the close syntactic association of lyre and voices".

the sentence is complete in itself. So with ἄγαλμα the sentence falls into place, both syntactically and semantically, as ἄγαλμα—by virtue of the associations it evokes—conjures up vividly the 'labour' involved.

13. Μυρμιδόνες

The Myrmidons were inhabitants of Aegina, who later emigrated with Peleus to Thessaly (*Il.*21.188/9, 24.534-7, *Od.*11.494-7) and fought beside Achilles and Patroclus at Troy (*Il.*2.681-5, 1.180, 328, etc.).

Sources: Ov.*Met.*7.614 ff., Hes.*fr.*205 M.-W. (quoted by Σ.*ad h.l.*, Tz. *ad Lucophr.* 176), Σ.*ad Il.*1.180, Hyginus, *Fab.*52; *Scriptores rerum mythicalarum Latini*, ed. G.H. Bode, vol. I, pp. 23, 142 (First Vatican Mythographer 67, Second Vatican Mythographer 204), Str.7.6.16; cf. also the Σ.*ad h.l.* (21, III 45/6 Dr.) and Tz. *ad Lucophr.* 176, both quoting Theogenes (*FHG* IV 511). The Myrmidons are mentioned once more by Pindar: ἁλὸς ἐπὶ κῦμα βάντες [ἤ]λθον ἄγγελο[ι] ὀπίσω | Σκυρόθεν Ν[ε]οπτόλεμο[ν] | εὐρυβίαν ἄγοντες, | ὃς διέπερσεν Ἰλίου πόλ[ιν]· | ἀλλ' οὔτε ματέρ' ἔπειτα κεδνὰν | εἶδεν οὔτε πατρωΐαις ἐν ἀρού[ραις] | ἵππους Μυρμιδόνων, | χαλκοκορυ[στ]ὰν [ὅ]μιλον ἐγε[ίρ]ων, *Pae.*6.100-8.

13. ἵνα

With ἵνα, referring to χώρας, the Myrmidons are introduced and the expectancy is raised that this reference will be elaborated. However, what follows is not a story about the Myrmidons. With the relative pronoun ὧν the poet switches back to the present.

It has been observed before that Pindar often uses a relative pronoun as a structuring device (see introduction, pp. 37-41); it has been observed by Radt, *Zweiter u. sechster Paian*, p. 155, and Bundy, I, p. 8/9, n. 27, that pronominal adverbs, like ἔνθεν (*P.*4.259), ὅθεν (e.g. *O.*1.8, 9.19), and τόθι (*O.*7.77) may perform a comparable function. ἵνα too can be used as such a hinge, camouflaging a major transition.

Cf. *O.*9, where the story of Heracles fighting with the gods is broken off (35/6) and where, after the motivation for this break off (37-41) a new story is introduced with φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας | ἄστει γλῶσσαν, ἵν' αἰολοβρέντα Διὸς αἴσαι | Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε Παρνασσοῦ καταβάντε | δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, κτλ, 41-4. In *P.*9.69 ἵνα is the hinge camouflaging the transition from the myth about Cyrene and the praise of the victor.

On the other hand, ἵνα can also introduce a subclause providing background information (e.g., *P.*4.103). It is crucial to realise that a hearer, in his linear perception of the text, at the point he hears ἵνα, does not know which one of both possible situations will occur. It is only in retrospect that he is in the position to realise that a transition has taken place and that the ἵνα was the hinge.

For the position of ἵνα, cf. Ὀρcοτριαίνα | ἵν' ἐν ἀγῶνι βαρυκτύπου | θάληcε, *N*.4.86-8.

13. πρότεροι

As ποτε (see my note on *N*.5.9 τάν ποτ', p. 113), πρότεροc may signal that the story moves to the (mythical) past (cf. *O*.3.10-3).

14. ᾤκηcαν

The choice for the aorist can be explained by realizing that the verb in this sentence performs an independent informative function. ἵνα can be called a *focus function slot*. It is a *slot*, because it provides an opening for a statement about the χώρα, that has to be filled; since one cannot possibly expect beforehand how the *slot* will be filled, anything being possible, every single constituent in the ἵνα phrase has *focus function* in a high degree, including the verb.

14. ὧν

With ἵνα (13) the Myrmidons are introduced and the expectancy is raised that this reference will be elaborated. However, what follows is not a story about the Myrmidons. With the relative pronoun ὧν (14) the poet switches back to the present. In his characteristic way (see introduction pp. 37-41), Pindar uses a relative pronoun to suggest—by effecting syntactical continuity—continuity as far as the content is concerned, whereas the pronoun will turn out to be the hinge between two larger passages that are quite different with respect to their contents. In line 17 δέ marks the next sentence (17/8) as a next, independent step in the sequence. This next sentence (17/8) does not stand on a par with the entire independent sentence preceding (12-7), but merely with the dependent clause that is introduced by the relative pronoun (14-7).

14. παλαίφατον

This adjective serves to associate the ideas πάλαι and φάτιc/φατόc with the notion it qualifies. When this qualified notion refers to something spoken out, the adjective denotes that it was 'spoken out a long time ago.'[61] When it qualifies something else it denotes that this was 'spoken of long ago,' i.e., 'of ancient fame, legendary.'

Cf. Βαccίδαιcιν ἅ τ' οὐ cπανίζει (*sc.* καλὰ ἔργα), παλαίφατοc γενεά, *N*.6.31; τὸ ... | παλαίφατον ἁμέτερον | γένοc, A.*Supp*.531/2; εἴπερ ἐcτὶν ἡ παλαίφατοc | Δίκη ξύνεδροc Ζηνὸc ἀρχαίοιc νόμοιc, S.*OC* 1381/2. Cf. also Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατον | εὐάνορεc, *N*.2.16/7.

---

[61] Cf. ἐν δὲ Πυθῶνι χρηcθὲν | παλαίφατον τέλεccεν, *O*.2.39/40; *Od*.9.507, A.*Ag*.750, A.*Th*.766, S.*OC* 454, etc.

14. ἀγοράν

In the appendix (pp. 619-24) it is argued that the mss.-reading ἀγοράν is probably correct. The metrical objections are not as grave as they seem to be. One can see why Pindar wanted the word. There are associations to ἀγορά, which square with the political dimension of Aristoclidas' victory. See also interpretation, pp. 201, 227.

15. ἐλεγχέεσσιν

This is the only certain occurence of τὸ ἔλεγχος in Pindar, in fact the only certain post-Homeric occurence of this noun. The sense is also completely Homeric. Aristoclides did not 'sully' the reputation of his ancestors by failing to do what he had to do. He did not bring disgrace upon himself and his ancestors by being defeated at the games. For a more detailed semantic analysis of the noun see appendix, pp. 624-6. For the idea see my note on οὐ κατελέγχεις, *P.*8.36 (p. 521). For the same idea expressed positively (the victor honours his family and his city be means of his victory) see my note on ἐγέραιρεν, *N.*5.8 (pp. 109/10). For the implied concept of πεῖρα see my note on lines 70/1 below (pp. 382/3).

15. Ἀριστοκλείδας γ'

The victor's name is mentioned at a relatively late stage in the ode. Surely, everyone present at the performance of this ode knew exactly what they were celebrating. Slow release of familiar information is one of the ways in which some sort of dramatic tension is created. See introduction, pp. 41/2.

In the appedix (pp. 626-30) I shall argue that γ' ἐὰν must be read instead of the mss.-reading τεὰν. What is the function of **γ'** here? It is my impression that 'determinative'[62] γε, especially with proper names, may under certain conditions perform the function of *topic* marker. This is especially the case with *topics* that are not in any way anticipated, and/or in cases where the author whishes to mark a new *topic* explicitly as such, while μέν or δέ are for some reason unavailable.

There are two examples of this in Pindar: καὶ μὰν ἁ Σαλαμίς γε θρέψαι φῶταν μαχατὰν | δύνατος, *N.*2.13/4, where Salamis turns up out of the blue. The need to mark it as a *topic* is motivated by the fact that in line 16 Acharnae will be mentioned as a contrasting *topic*. μέν instead of γε is impossible because of the following μέν ... δέ balancing *topics* at another level (14/5). Another example is: ἀλλ' ὅ γε Μέλαμπος οὐκ ἤθελεν | λιπὼν πατρίδα μο[να]ρχε̣[ῖν] Ἄργει | θέμενος οἰ[ω]νοπόλον γέρας, *Pae.*4.28-30, where δέ is excluded because of the preceding ἀλλ', while μέν would have been awkward since no contrasting *topic* is to follow. The particle γε often has this function in Homeric diction. Consider examples like ἤτοι ὅ γ' ὣς εἰπὼν

[62] Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 114.

κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετο, *Il.*1.68, where the position of ἄρ' proves that ὅ γ' is a left-dislocated theme constituent ('but he, having spoken thus, he sat down').[63] Similar examples are to be found in prose. In X.*Ag.*2.26, e.g., a few examples are given of generals who recognized Agesilaus' superiority. Each general is mentioned by name and explicly being marked as a *topic*. The first is Autophradates, introduced with γε γάρ,[64] γάρ introducing the entire set of examples, then we have Κότυς δ' αὖ, then Μαύσωλός γε μήν, then Τάχως γε μήν. Each γε marks another, yet unmentioned, general as the *topic* of the section that is to follow.

This also applies to γε here. Aristoclidas turns up rather unexpectedly at this point of the ode, the more so since the ἵνα phrase in 13/4 seems to anticipate a shift from the present to the past. In fact, the hearer will realize that with ὧν we return to the present only when he hears Aristoclidas' name.

15-16. οὐκ ... | ἐμίανε

οὐκ ἐλεγχέεσσιν ... | ἐμίανε ... μαλαχθείς is a *litotes* (and one with a remarkably wide range[65]). By being victorious in the pancration Aristoclidas honoured his warrior-ancestors greatly. The verb occurs only here in Pindar, but cf. ἐχθίστοισι μὴ ψεύδεσιν | καταμιάναις εἰπὲ γένναν, *P.*4.99/100. The verb is frequently metaphorically used to refer to moral pollution, 'taint, defile.'

Cf. μιάνας καὶ καταισχύνας κλέος, Sol.32.3 W.; εὔφημον ἦμαρ οὐ πρέπει κακαγγέλωι | γλώσσηι μιαίνειν, A.*Ag.*636/7; μιαίνων τὴν δίκην, *ibid.*1669; μαινομένοις δ' ἐπιπνεῖ λαοδάμας | μιαίνων εὐσέβειαν Ἄρης, A.*Th.*343/4; θεοὺς μιαίνειν οὔ τις ἀνθρώπων σθένει, S.*Ant.*1044; ἐγὼ πέφυκά τ' εὐσεβεῖν καὶ βούλομαι, | φιλῶ τ' ἐμαυτήν, καὶ κλέος τοὐμοῦ πατρὸς | οὐκ ἂν μιάναιμ', οὐδὲ συγγόνωι χάριν | δοίην ἂν ἐξ ἧς δυσκλεὴς φανήσομαι, E.*Hel.*998-1001; Pl.*Lg.*868b, *Ti.*69d, etc.

For some general remarks on *litotes*, see my note on line 76 below (pp. 393/4).

15-16. γ' ἐὰν | ... κατ' αἶσαν

It is argued in the appendix (pp. 626-30) that the mss. reading τεὰν is untenable and that γ' ἐὰν (Negris) must be the correct reading. By winning the pancration Aristoclidas did great honour to his ancestors, and he did so in accordance with his αἶσα. ἐὰν κατ' αἶσαν has reference to the fulfillment of the expectancies with respect to Aristoclidas

---

[63] See E.J. Bakker, 'Homeric Discourse and Enjambement: A Cognitive Approach', *TAPhA* 120, 1990, 1-21, esp. p. 12, citing: C. Ruijgh, 'La place des enclites dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel', *Paper read at the Ernst Risch Colloquium in Basle* 1988.

[64] The mss. reading Αὐτοφραδάτης τε γὰρ is obviously a majuscle corruption.

[65] If *litotes* is defined, with Gellius 3.6.11, as *laudatio non virtutibus appellandis, sed vitiis detrahendis*, the *vitium* is expressed here with remarkable elaboration.

based on the successes of his ancestors, the great Myrmidon warriors. Because of their accomplishments it was Aristoclidas' 'destiny' to win.

It is at first sight suprising that ἑάν emphatically presents Aristoclidas' αἶcα as 'his very own' destiny. κατ' αἶcαν would have sufficed to make the point that Aristoclidas' victory was a confirmation of his destiny. On closer consideration, however, the emphatic (note the *hyperbaton*) possessive pronoun mirrors the unique circumstances of Aristoclidas' victory precisely. ἑάν specifies Aristoclidas' αἶcα, inherent to his being a descendant from the Myrmidons, as his unique αἶcα, inherent to his having been successful without any assistance and to his becoming a *thearos* because of his victory. See further interpretation, pp. 201/2, 227.

16. περιcθενεῖ

The portrayal of Aristoclidas' opponents (but see the note on παγκρατίου cτόλωι below) as 'exceedingly strong' adds to the glory of his victory. The adjective occurs only once more in Pindar: cῶμα μὲν πάντων ἕπεται θανάτωι περιcθενεῖ, *fr.* 131b.1 (cf. also μή με περιcθενέων δηλήcεται ὀξέϊ χαλκῶι, *Od.* 22.368).

The games, and especially disciplines like wrestling, boxing, and the pancration, are, not surprisingly, also elsewhere associated with strength. Cf. καὶ cθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θραcεῖ, *N.* 5.39, of the Isthmian Games (see my note, pp. 165-7); cὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶcαι cθένει, *N.* 10.48; ὃc ἂν χερcὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήcαιc | τὰ μέγιcτ' ἀέθλων ἕληι τόλμαι τε καὶ cθένει, *P.* 10.23/4; φέρει γὰρ Ἰcθμοῖ | νίκαν παγκρατίου, cθένει τ' ἔκπαγλοc ἰδεῖν τε μορφάειc, ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴcχιον φυᾶc, *I.* 7.21/2; ἀγωνίαc δ', ἕρκοc οἷον, cθένοc, *P.* 5.113; κρίνειν ταχυτᾶτά τε] λαιψηρῶν ποδῶν | Ἕλλαcι καὶ γυ[ίων ἀ]ριcταλκὲc cθένοc, B.7.6/7, etc. For βία in similar contexts cf. ἔν τ' ἀέθλοιcιν ἀριcτεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν, *N.* 11.14; πρόcθε χειρῶν βίαν | δε[ί]ξομεν· τὰ δ' ἐπίοντα δα[ίμω]ν κρινεῖ, B.17.45/6, etc. For ἀλκά, cf. παῖδ' ἐρατὸν ⟨δ'⟩ Ἀρχεcτράτου | αἴνηcα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸc ἀλκᾶι, *O.* 10.100, etc.

16. μαλαχθείc

μαλάccω means 'to soften'. In the only other Pindaric instance the verb is used for the 'quietening' of the sea and the wind: ἐπερχόμενόν τε μαλάccοντεc βίαιον | πόντον ὠκείαc τ' ἀνέμων ... ῥιπάc (*sc.* οἱ Τυνδαρίδαι), *fr.* 140c.[66] Here μαλαχθείc, 'having become soft,' has connotations of 'being weak' and perhaps also 'being a coward.'

---

[66] This is the text printed by Snell-Maehler. The fragment has come down to us in two of Plutarch's treatises. In *Def.Orac.* 30 (426c) it is quoted as ἐπέρχομενοί τε μαλάccοντεc βία τὸν κτλ; in *Adv.Epic.* 23 (1103c) as ἐπερχόμενόν τε μαλάξονταc βίαιον κτλ.

This is the wrong attitude in a pancration-contest, guaranteed to bring defeat. Therefore such an attitude would bring shame on the contestant's ancestors and his home-land.

For μαλθακός having connotations like 'weak, not persevering, giving up,' cf. μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής, *Il.*17.588; cὺ μαλακίζου, τὴν δ' ἐμὴν αὐθαδίαν | ὀργῆς τε τραχύτητα μὴ 'πιπλήςςέ μοι, A.*Pr.*79/80; οὐ γάρ ποτ' Ἄργους γαῖαν ἐς τὸ μαλθακὸν | προςηγόμεςθα, E.*Or.*714/5; Hdt.7.153, X.*Mem.*1.2.2. In ὅμως δὲ φεῦγε, μηδὲ μαλθακὸς γένηι, A.*Eum.*74, 'keep running and don't be weak, don't give up', μαλθακός is paradoxically used for being weak in flight. It is worth noting that as used by Pindar the adjectival forms of the stem (μαλακός/μαλθακός) are entirely lacking the pejorative connotations so frequent in other authors. See further my note on *P.*8.6 (pp. 474-6).

Epode A

17. παγκρατίου cτόλωι

The discipline in which the victor sucessfully competed is mentioned. This is one of the stock themes of the victory ode.

The noun **cτόλος** means 'expedition,' by land, but mostly by sea, 'voyage,' especially for warlike purposes.[67] The noun does not occur in Homer and Hesiod and not in archaic lyric outside Pindar. It is frequent in Herodotus, tragedy, and Attic prose. Pindar uses the noun twice, apart from *h.l.*, in a metaphorical way. In εὐανθέα δ' ἀναβάςομαι cτόλον ἀμφ' ἀρετᾶι | κελαδέων, *P.*2.62/3, Pindar metaphorically describes the course of his ode as the course of a triumphal ship (cf. *P.*11.39/40, *N.*4.70, *v.i.* comm. *ad* 26/7), decorated with garlands (εὐανθέα, cf. A.R.2.159, Prop.3.24.15). In Αἴγινα φίλα μᾶτερ, ἐλευθέρωι cτόλωι | πόλιν τάνδε κόμιζε, *P.*8.98/9, Pindar prays that Aegina may go on on her 'voyage of freedom' (see my note, pp. 600-2).

The noun may also be used metaphorically to refer to a group of people, not necessarily on an expedition or journey and not for warlike purposes.

Cf. δέξαςθ' ἱκέτην | τὸν θηλυγενῆ cτόλον αἰδοίωι | πνεύματι χώρας, A.*Supp.*27-9 (cf. *ibid.*187, 320, 487, 933, 944), where the group of suppliant women are portrayed as an 'expedition' from Egypt to Greece; ὄμμα γὰρ πάςης χθονὸς | Θηςῆιδος ἐξίκοιτ' ἄν, εὐκλεὴς λόχος | παίδων γυναικῶν, καὶ

[67] Cf. μετὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέζω cτόλον cτείλαντες ἀπέπεμψαν ἐπὶ τὰς 'Αθήνας ... οὐκέτι κατὰ θάλαςςαν cτείλαντες, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἤπειρον, Hdt.5.64; ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ Λιβύην ἄλλος cτρατιῆς μέγας cτόλος, Hdt.4.145; cτόλον 'Αργείων χιλιοναύτην, A.*Ag.*45, of the expedition against Troy (cf. *ibid.*577; E.*IT* 10); A.*Pers.*795 (cf. *ibid.*400), S.*OC* 1305, S.*Ph.*246/7 (cf. also *ibid.*73, 243, 781, 916, 1037), etc. Also, metaphorically, of expeditions without warlike purposes, as in: κἀκεῖθεν οὔ μοι μακρὸς εἰς Οἴτην cτόλος, and τὸν οἴκαδ' ἤπειγον cτόλον, S.*Ph.*490, 499.

στόλος πρεςβυτίδων, A.*Eu.*1025-7; ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικείων στόλων, *ibid.*856; νοςεῖ δέ μοι πρόπας στόλος, S.*OT* 170 ("στόλος, like στρατός [Pi.*P.*2.46, etc.], = λαός", Jebb *ad loc.*).

The περισθενὴς παγκρατίου στόλος here either refers to Aristoclidas' own 'exceedingly strong pancration expedition' to Nemea, or to 'the exceedingly stong host of men competing in the pancration,' viz. his opponents. The first option uneqivocally imparts the compliment that the victor's 'expedition' was περισθενής. Presenting the victor's partaking in competion as a 'voyage' is paralleled by αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις | Φυλακίδαι πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι, *I.*5.59/60, where the victor's partaking in the pancration contest is metaphorically called a 'race of blows.'[68] The specific metaphor στόλος used here evokes connotations of hostility, thus implicitly paralleling the pancration contest with warfare, which is suggestive of the hardships of contests and strenthens the parallel with the Myrmidons. With the latter interpretation, the use of στόλος may be compared to the examples of στόλος being a metaphor for a group of people quoted above, and especially to ὁρῶ μὲν ἀνδρῶν τόνδε γυμνάδα στόλον | στείχοντα θεωρὸν ἐκ τρόχων πεπαυμένον, E.*fr.*105 N. The *suppressed tenor* of στόλος then is 'host (of men competing)', the *ground* being that both in the case of a group of men competing in the Nemean pancration-contest and in the case of a (naval) expedition for warlike purposes we are dealing with a large group of men, leaving home on a voyage, in order to fight, with the purpose of winning a victory. Aristoclidas had to beat more than just one opponent before he was crowned (see my note on *P.*8.81, pp. 581/2). The *target* of the metaphor then is that through the noun στόλος connotations of hostility[69] are attributed to Aristoclides' rival competitors, which adds to the glory of his victory.

A comparable metaphor, with the same *target* is found in *P.*11: Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεγξαν | Ἑλλανίδα στρατιὰν ὠκύτατι, *P.*11.49/50. Cf. also ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' Ἕλλανα στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, *N.*10.25. For the sentiment cf. Philostatrstus' ironical description of an Olympic victory: ἔοικε γὰρ μὴ τοῦ ἀντιπάλου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ κεκρατηκέναι· βοῶσι γοῦν ἀναπηδήσαντες τῶν θάκων καὶ οἱ μὲν τὼ χεῖρε ἀνασείουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐσθῆτα, οἱ δὲ αἴρονται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, οἱ δὲ τοῖς πλησίον ἱλαρὸν προσπαλαίουσι, *Im.*2.6.2.

It is not easy to make a choice between the two interpretations. Both make excellent sense in the context, parallels can be adduced for

---

[68] Unless the scholiast is right in taking πλαγᾶν δρόμον as τὴν τῶν πληγῶν ὁρμήν (Σ. 75b, III 249 Dr.), the trainer's activity being to 'direct the course of the blows', rather then to 'guide' his brother in the 'race', the contest that is about blows. However, the verb seems to plead against this option.

[69] Cf. Dissen *ad loc.*

both, and both are complimentary to the victor, the former in an obvious and direct way, the latter indirectly. Ambiguity does not seem functional in this case. The following connection of the victor's accomplishment with a voyage undertaken by Heracles might be an indirect indication that the former interpretation is what the poet has meant.

17-18

Against fatiguing blows in the low-laying plain of Nemea 'hip hip hurray!' brings a healing remedy.

17-18. Victory heals wounds

Victory—here symbolized by the victory song τήνελλα καλλίνικε—is presented as a 'medicine' healing the victor of his injuries and of the hardships of training and competition. The same idea is elaborately expressed by the opening lines of *N.*4: ἄριςτος εὐφροςύνα πόνων κεκριμένων Ι ἰατρός· αἱ δὲ cοφαὶ Ι Μοιcᾶν θύγατρες ἀοιδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἁπτόμεναι. Ι οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόcον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει Ι γυῖα, τόccον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι cυνάορος, 1-5 (also for a pancratiast). The medical terms used here (ὑγιηρόν) and in *N.*4 (ἰατρός) entail a specification of the familiar πόνος motif to suit the specific circumstances of both victories. It is suggetsed that in both cases the victor was more than just somewhat tired from the competition. Severe injuries were a harsh reality in the combat sports, especially in the pancration, the fiercest of all sports. Aristoclidas was badly hurt, and so was Timasarchus, the victor celebrated in *N.*4.

It is somewhat surprising to find the same sentiment in an ode for a victor in the double foot race, quite a safe discipline, one would think: χαίρω δὲ πρόcφορον Ι ἐν μὲν ἔργωι κόμπον ἱείς, ἐπαοιδαῖς δ' ἀνήρ Ι νώδυνον καί τις κάματον θῆκεν, *N.*8.48-50. But here κάματος refers to the psychical pain the victor suffers because of his father's death, as the preceding lines make clear (ὦ Μέγα, τὸ δ' αὖτις τεὰν ψυχὰν κομίξαι Ι οὔ μοι δύνατον· ... Ι cεῦ δὲ πάτραι Χαριάδαις τ' ἐλαφρὸν Ι ὑπερεῖcαι λίθον Μοιcαῖον ἕκατι ποδῶν εὐωνύμων Ι δὶς δὴ δυοῖν, 44-8).[70]

For severe injuries in the combat sports (especially in boxing and the pancration), cf. e.g. *AP* 11.81 (Lucillus), 77.75, Libanius 64.119, Galen.*Protrep.*12 (1.32 K., 124/5 M.), Philost.*Heroic.*15 (147 K.), Paus. 6.15.5. Artemidorus (Daldianus Onirocritus) 1.61/2 regards dreams about pancration and boxing as bad omens, predicting severe damage to

---

[70] For ἐπαοιδαί, 'spells', used to bring back the deads, cf. ἀνδρὸς δ' ἐπειδὰν αἷμ' ἀναcπάcῃ κόνις Ι ἅπαξ θανόντος, οὔτις ἔcτ' ἀνάcταcις. Ι τούτων ἐπῳδὰς οὐκ ἐποίηcεν πατὴρ Ι οὑμός (Apollo speaks), A.*Eu.*647-50; for the noun used in a medical context (so as to suit νώδυνος), cf. *P.*3.51, S.*Aj.*582, Pl.*R.*426b, etc.

the body. Several fighters died during competition: Philostr.*Im.*2.6 (cf. *Gymn.*21, Paus.8.40.1/2, about the pancratiast Arrichion, who died but won, because his opponent declined just before that); *inscr. Olymp.*, G.J.M.G. te Riele, *BCH* 88, 1964, 186/7 (the boxer Agathos Daemon); Paus.6.9.6, 8, 40.3-5, Photius 190b (boxers); *IK* Ephesos 7.1 (Metropolis Ioniae) 3446 (= Peek, *Vers.Inschr.*680, a pancratiast); *Syll.*[3]274 (Moretti, *IAG* 29, = Ebert 44); Ps.Hipp.*Epid.*5.14 (5.212 L.) (both wrestlers). The accidental killing of one's opponent was a juridical issue (Pl.*Lg.*865a/b, D.23.53, Arist.*Ath.Pol.*57.3).

• *Literature:* On injuries in the combat sports, see further R. & M. Brophie, *AJPh* 106, 1985, 171-98; Poliakoff, *AJPh* 107, 1986, 400-2; Poliakoff, *Kampfsport in der Antike*, pp. 119-22. On the remedial powers of song and festivity, see P. Laín Entralgo, *The Therapy of the Word in Classical Antiquity*, tr. L.J. Rather & J.M. Sharp, New Haven 1970; A.L.T. Bergren, 'Helen's Good Drug: *Odyssey* IV.1-305', *Contemporary Litery Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts* (ed. S. Krésic), Ottawa 1981, 205-210.

• *The* πόνοϲ *motif, general:* The nexus labour/success recurs repeatedly in Pindar's epinicia.[71] These passages have in common that they enhance the joy of success by emphasising the labour that preceded it, and that they "present athletics as self-sacrifice, specifically for the good of the state,"[72] which squares with the aristocratic *agathos* ethics. However, the precise wording of occurences of the πόνοϲ motif, including the less elaborate examples, relates closer to the discipline in which the victory was won than is generally assumed. Nouns like πόνοϲ, μόχθοϲ, and κάματοϲ refer specifically to the hardships of combat sports in the great majority of cases.

Cf. ἴϲθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου ϲὺν τύχαι μόχθων ἄμοιβαν | ἐπαύρεο, *N.*5.48/9 (pancratiast), with comm. *ad loc.*; μεγάλαν | ἀρετὰν θυμῶι λαβεῖν, | τῶν δὲ μόχθων ἀμπνοάν, *O.*8.5-7 (wrestler); ἔργοιϲ δὲ καλοῖϲ ἔϲοπτρον ἴϲαμεν ἑνὶ τρόπωι, | εἰ Μναμοϲύναϲ ἕκατι λιπαράμπυκοϲ | εὕρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖϲ ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖϲ, *N.*7.14-6 (pentathlon, of which wrestling was a part); Οὐλία παῖϲ ἔνθα νικάϲαιϲ δὶϲ ἔϲχεν Θεαῖοϲ εὐφόρων λάθαν πόνων, *N.*10.24 (wrestler); Κλεάνδρωι τιϲ ἁλικίαι τε λύτρον εὔδοξον, ὦ νέοι, καμάτων | πατρὸϲ ἀγλαὸν Τελεϲάρχου παρὰ πρόθυρον | ἰὼν ἀνεγειρέτω | κῶμον, Ἰϲθμιάδοϲ τε νίκαϲ ἄποινα ... παυϲάμενοι δ' ἀπράκτων κακῶν | γλυκύ τι δαμωϲόμεθα καὶ μετὰ πόνον, *I.*8.1-8 (pancratiast); εἰ πόνοϲ ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται, *N.*7.74 (pentathlon, cf. also line 16). Cf. also *O.*10.93 (boxer), *I.*5.57 (pancration, see below).

As a contrast, a victory in the chariot race is called an 'atoning for expenditure', rather than a 'compensation for toil'.

---

[71] It is worth noting that Bacchylides places far less emphasis upon the toilsome aspects of athletics. He refers to the labour of athletics only once (13.56, for a pancratiast).

[72] Carey, *Passionate Intellect*, p. 5.

Cf. ἔχοντα Πυθωνόθεν | τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν | μέλος χαρίεν, *P.*5.105-7; cf. also *I.*4.29, *P.*1.90.

Seeming exceptions can on closer consideration be accounted for in the light of specific circumstances of the victory: In *I.*1.42-6, πόνος (42) and μόχθος (46) refer to the hardships of a chariot race, because the victor participated personally in the contest; the emphatic reference to this in line 15 makes clear that this was highly unusual. The reference to κάματος in *P.*5.47, in an ode for a chariot victor, applies to the fact that the victor was able to finish in the midst of fourty tumbling chariots, as the following γάρ phrase explains (49-51). The reference to κάματος in *P.*1.46 applies to the wars fought by Hieron (47-50), not to his chariot race. The collocation of πόνος and δαπάνα in *O.*5.15 occurs in a generic context with no reference to athletics. The only certain examples of δαπάνα unambiguously referring to the expenditure upon training of athletes are *I.*5.57 (with μόχθος) and *I.*6.10 (with πόνος); it may be no coincidence that these are both odes for Phylacidas, a member of a family that was very much engaged in combat sports. The reference to κάματος in *P.*12.28, in an ode for a victor in the flute-playing contest, occurs in a generic context; however, it seems fair to refer it to the victor; it must be realized that playing the *aulos*, which was attached with straps to one's face, for a huge audience, certainly involved a great deal of effort, which may even be called toil.

17. καματωδέων ... πλαγᾶν

The hardships of the pancration contest, which the victory is said to cure, are graphically described as 'injuring blows.' In αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιδάμαις | Φυλακίδαι πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι, *I.*5.59/60, the same noun is used with reference to the pancration.

For the noun, cf. also ὑπὸ στερεῶι πυρὶ | πλαγαῖς τε σιδάρου, *O.*10.36/7; *P.*4.245/6. For the adjective, cf. ἄνικ' ἀνθρώπων καματώδεες οἴχονται μέριμναι | στηθέων ἔξω, *fr.*124a/b.5/6; θέρεος καματώδεος ὥρηι, Hes.*Op.*584; *ibid.*664.

Competitors in the pancration were allowed to make blows that were forebidden in the boxing-contest. The hands were unprotected by thongs or other covering. Blows with open hand were allowed as well as punches with the fist and one was allowed to strike at every part of the body. Both types of hitting are represented on the fragment of a red-figured *kylix* in Berlin (Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, fig. 153, p. 438),[73] where a fallen youth is portrayed, bleeding freely from the nose and bearing on his back the imprint of his opponent's fingers, while at the same time his fist is clenched ready to strike. Cf. also οἱ παγκρατιάζοντες, ὦ παῖ, κεκινδυνευμένηι προσχρῶνται τῆι πάληι· ... οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ σφυρῶι προσπαλαίουσι καὶ τὴν χεῖρα στρεβλοῦσι προσόντος τοῦ παίειν καὶ ἐνάλλεσθαι· ταυτὶ γὰρ τοῦ παγκρατιάζειν ἔργα πλὴν τοῦ δάκνειν ἢ ὀρύττειν,

---

[73] See also *JHS* 26, p. 8; Hartwig, *Meisterschalen*, fig. 12.

Philostratus, *Im.*2.6.3. For a more detailed account, see E.N. Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London 1910, 435-50; W. Rudolph, *Olympischer Kampfsport in der Antike; Faustkampf, Ringkampf und Pankration in den griechischen Nationalfestspiele*, Berlin 1965, 63-77 (on hitting, see esp. pp. 66-8); H.A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, London 1964.

18. ἄκος ὑγιηρόν

An ἄκος is a 'remedy.' τὸ καλλίνικον brings a 'healing remedy against,' i.e., a cure from 'injuring blows.' ὑγιηρόν defines the general notion ἄκος as a specific remedy in the field of medicine ('medicine, drug'). Moreover, ὑγιηρόν makes clear that the blows were 'injuring' rather than just 'fatiguing.'

The noun **ἄκος** occurs once more in Pindar: γιγνώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ μοῖσαν παρέχων ἅλις· | [ε]ἰ καί τι Διω[νύσ]ου ἄρο[υρ]α φέρει | βιόδωρον ἀμαχανίας ἄκος, | ἄνιππός εἰμι καὶ βουνομίας ἀδαέστερος, *Pae.*4.23-7, of wine being a remedy against ἀμαχανία. Cf. also οἶσε θέειον, γρηΰ, κακῶν ἄκος, οἶσε δέ μοι πῦρ, | ὄφρα θεειώσω μέγαρον, *Od.*22.481/2, of fumigation being a 'remedy' against the defilement of the palace; μαίνηι γὰρ ὡς ἄλγιστα, κοὔτε φαρμάκοις | ἄκη λάβοις ἂν οὔτ' ἄνευ τούτων νοσεῖς, E.*Ba.*326/7; ὕπνου τόδ' ἀντίμολπον ἐντέμνων ἄκος, A.*Ag.*17, "lit. 'Incising this remedy, a song-antidote to sleep', i.e. singing as a cure for, and antidote to, sleep", Denniston & Page *ad loc.*; ἄκος τομαῖον ἐλπίσασα πημάτων, A.*Ch.*539; τῶν γὰρ ἡμαρτημένων | ἄκη μὲν ἔστι, προσφορὰ δ' οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτι, S.*OC* 1269/70, 'there are remedies for the faults committed (i.e. if Oedipus will return to Thebes with Polyneices), while there is no possibility of adding to them', Jebb *ad loc.*; *Il.*9.249/50, A.*Supp.*366/7, S.*Aj.*362/3, Hdt.4.187, etc. **ὑγιηρός** occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar, but cf. Hp.*Aer.*10, where it is opposed to νοσερόν, *ibid.*4, *Epid.*1.5, Hdt.2.77, 4.187.

18. ἐν βαθυπεδίωι Νεμέαι

After the implicit reference in line 2 (ἐν ἱερομηνίαι Νεμεάδι), it is here explicitly stated that the victory celebrated had been won in Nemea.

The site of the Nemean festival was a deep-lying vale, beneath the hills of Phlious (*N.*6.44). In τὰ δὲ κοίλαι λέοντος | ἐν βαθυστέρνου νάπαι κάρυξε Θήβαν | ἱπποδρομίαι κρατέων, *I.*3.12/3, the site of Nemea is described as κοίλαι ... νάπαι, and if the reading βαθυστέρνωι of the Σ.*ad loc.* is accepted, also as 'deep bosomed.' In *O.*9.87 Nemea is referred to by κόλπον. Cf. also Φλειοῦντά τε καὶ Νεμεαίου | Ζηνὸς εὐθαλὲς πέδον, B.9.4/5. For a description of the geographical setting of Nemea see S.G. Miller, *Nemea. A Guide to the Site and Museum*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1990, pp. 8-12. The adjective βαθυπέδιος, 'with low-lying plain,' occurs only *h.l.* But cf. comparable compounds, like βαθυκόλπου | Γᾶς, *P.*9.101/2; ἔθηκε καὶ βαθυλείμων ὑπὸ Κίρρας πετρᾶν | ἀγὼν κρατησίποδα Φρικίαν, *P.*10.15/6.

18. τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει

'In the low-laying plain of Nemea the "he's a jolly good fellow" brings the healing remedy against injuring blows.' τὸ καλλίνικον is

subject of φέρει.[74] καματωδέων ... πλαγᾶν ἄκος ὑγιηρόν is object. τὸ καλλίνικον, when standing unqualified, denotes the traditional impromptu victory hymn and dance, named after the hymn's refrain τήνελλα καλλίνικε | χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις, | αὐτός τε καὶ Ἰόλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύω, Archil.*fr*.324 W. (Pindar explicitly cites this hymn in: τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος | φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδώς, | ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἁγεμονεῦσαι | κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστωι σὺν ἑταίροις, *O*.9.1-4).

The traditional extempore celebration τήνελλα καλλίνικε, referred to by τὸ καλλίνικον, here symbolizes the joy of victory in general, which makes up for the hardships of the contest. The fact that we cannot tell whether φέρει is a generic, historic, or a real present, effects a merging of the 'hip hip hurray' sung in Nemea and the later official celebration to which Pindar's ode contributed. τὸ καλλίνικον takes us back vividly to the scene of the victory, conjuring up spontaneity also for the present celebration. See introduction, pp. 35/6, 53/4; cf. also my note on κῶμος, *P*.8.70 (pp. 563-5). The association of καλλίνικος with Heracles anticipates the transition to Heracles in the following lines.

Pindar qualifies his own ode as καλλίνικος in εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἁλίωι | σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων | θαμά κε, τῶιδε μέλει κλιθείς, | ὕμνον κελάδησε καλλίνικον, *N*.4.13-6, and probably also in ἔχοντα Πυθωνόθεν | τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν | μέλος χαρίεν, *P*.5.105-7. The effect is comparable to what we have here: Pindar associates his own highly intricate artefacts with the spontaneous celebration on the scene of the victory.

καλλίνικος is commonly used with *ellips* of the gouverning noun. It is masculine, feminine, or neutre, according to the noun that is to be understood.[75] In ἔτι τὰν Ἡρακλέους | καλλίνικον ἀείδω, E.*HF* 679/80, it is feminine because the poet may have ὠιδάν in mind, as in ἀλλ' ἐπάειδε | καλλίνικον ὠιδὰν ἐμῶι χορῶι, E.*El*.863/4 (cf. 880). It is masculine in *O*.9.2, in τὸν καλλίνικον μετὰ θεῶν ἐκώμασεν, E.*HF* 180, and in τὸν

---

[74] Some scholars, like the Σ.*ad loc.*, take Aristoclides as the subject of φέρει. Thus e.g. Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 29): " 'He won at Nemea and wears, &c.' (cf. *N*.5.54, *I*.6.21), ἄκος being an extension of the predicate"; see also Bury *ad loc.* (p. 48): 'But he hath a healthful balm for weary blows and bruises, even the hymn of victory which the deep dale of Nemea doled to him'. However, it is highly unnatural to supply a subject from the preceeding sentence if an excellent candidate for this function is available in the sentence itself. Farnell's argument (*ad loc.*, p. 255/6), that if Aristoclides were the subject, φέρεται would have been the more natural predicate, seems to be undercut by the use of the active in similar contexts elsewhere (e.g., *O*.8.64, *O*.10.67, *I*.7.21). The verb φέρειν may qualify as 'colourless' (see introduction, p. 31) to the extent that it indicates that the joy of victory causes the healing of pain while leaving the technicalities of this procedure to the imagination of the audience.

[75] See Bond on E.*HF* 180 (p. 115).

καλλίνικον κλεινὸν ἐπεπράξατε | ἐc cτόνον, ἐc δάκρυα, E.*Ba.*1161/2 (the Bacchants' victory turns out to be their punishment, cf. 1147; on the tragic use of epinician terminology in the *Bacchae*, see especially Heath, *AJPh* 109, 1988, 194/5), where ὕμνον, as in ὕμνον ... καλλίνικον, *N.*4.16 (see above), or κῶμον may be understood. Here it is neutre, as perhaps also in οὔτοι ῥαιδίωc γε cυμβαλὼν | ἔχθραν τιc αὐτῆι καλλίνικον ἄιcεται[76], E.*Med.*44/5; one could supply μέλοc[77], as in *P.*5.105-7 (see above).

The adjective is also used to qualify the victor (as it qualifies Heracles in Archilochus' original version): τὰ μὲν {ἐν} ἅρμαcι καλλίνικοι πάλαι | Ὀλυμπίαι τ' ἀγώνων πολυφάτων | ἔcχον θοὰν ἀκτῖνα cὺν ἵπποιc, | Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ cτάδιον καταβάντεc ἤλεγξαν | Ἑλλανίδα cτρατιὰν ὠκύτατι, *P.*11.46-50; Πυθιάδοc δ' ἐν δρόμωι κάρυξ ἀνέειπέ νιν (*sc.* Hieron's city) ἀγγέλλων Ἱέρωνοc ὑπὲρ καλλινίκου | ἅρμαcι, *P.*1.32/3. Cf. also ἐπεὶ cτεφάνουc | ἓξ ὤπαcεν Κάδμου cτρατῶι ἐξ ἀέθλων, | καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδοc, *I.*1.10-2. The refrain τήνελλα καλλίνικοc is sung at the very end of two comedies by Aristophanes (*Ach.*1227-34, *Av.*1764). Cf. also Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον, Callim.*fr.*384.39 Pf.

• *τήνελλα καλλίνικε:* The scholia on *O.*9.1 and Ar.*Av.*1764 explain the custom: ὁ Ἀρχίλοχοc πρὸ τούτων τῶν λυρικῶν γενόμενοc, θέληcαc ὕμνον ἀναβαλέcθαι εἰc Ἡρακλέα ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι, ἀπορήcαc κιθαρωιδοῦ διά τινοc λέξεωc μιμήcαcθαι τὸν ῥυθμὸν καὶ τὸν ἦχον τῆc κιθάραc ἐπεχείρηcε. cυντάξαc οὖν τοῦτο τὸ τήνελλα οὕτω τὰ ἑξῆc ἀνεβάλλετο. καὶ αὐτὸc μὲν τὸν ἦχον τῆc κιθάραc ὑποκρινόμενοc ἔλεγεν ἐν μέcωι τὸ τήνελλα καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα, οἷον (cit. *fr.*324 W.). τὸ λοιπὸν οἱ ἀποροῦντεc κιθαρωιδοῦ τούτωι τῶι κόμματι ἐχρῶντο, τρὶc αὐτὸ ἐπιφωνοῦντεc. κεκράτηκεν οὖν ἐπὶ πάντων νικηφόρων παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν τῆc νίκηc ἐπάιδεcθαι τὸ κόμμα, Σ.f *ad O.*9.1; κωμάζει δὲ πρὸc τὸν τοῦ Διὸc βωμὸν ὁ νίκηcαc μετὰ τῶν φίλων, αὐτὸc τῆc ὠιδῆc ἐξηγούμενοc, Σ.e *ad O.*9.1; περὶ δὲ τοῦ τήνελλα Ἐρατοcθένηc φηcὶν (241 F 44) ὅτι ὅτε ὁ αὐλητὴc ἢ ὁ κιθαριcτὴc μὴ παρῆν, ὁ ἔξαρχοc αὐτὸ μεταλαβὼν ἔλεγεν ἔξω τοῦ μέλουc, ὁ δὲ κωμαcτῶν χορὸc ἐπέβαλλε τὸ καλλίνικε, καὶ οὕτω cυνειρόμενον γέγονε τὸ τήνελλα καλλίνικε, Σ.k *ad O.*9.1; ἔθοc δὲ ἦν κωμάζειν τὴν νίκην ἑcπέραc τοῖc νικηφόροιc μετ' αὐλητοῦ· μὴ παρόντοc δὲ αὐλητοῦ εἷc τῶν ἑταίρων ἀνακρουόμενοc ἔλεγε· (cit. *fr.*324 W.), Σ.h *ad O.*9.1; τὸ τήνελλα μίμηcίc ἐcτι φωνῆc κρούματοc αὐλοῦ ποιᾶc ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐφυμνίου οὗ εἶπεν Ἀρχίλοχοc εἰc τὸν Ἡρακλέα μετὰ τὸν μέγιcτον τῶν ἄθλων αὐτοῦ[78] (cit. *fr.*324 W.). δοκεῖ δὲ πρῶτοc Ἀρχίλοχοc νικήcαc ἐν Πάρωι τὸν Δήμητροc ὕμνον ἑαυτῶι τοῦτον ἐπιπεφωνηκέναι, Σ. *ad* Ar.*Av.*1764. Cf. also Tz.*Chil.*1.688 ff., *Suda* 4.542.14 Adler, Hesych. *s.v.* τήνεβλα, Phot. *s.v.* τήνελλα, *Et.Gen.* p. 281 Miller, *EM* p. 757.32, *Append.Prov.*4.87 (*Paroem.Gr.*1.455.1). "It was the 'See the conquering hero comes' of the Greek", Gildersleeve on *O.*9.1 (p. 203).

---

[76] Muretus: οἴcεται codd. See Stinton, *JHS* 97, 1977, 140.
[77] Thus Bury (*ad loc.*, p. 48) and Slater (*s.v.* καλλίνικοc, p. 263).
[78] West: μετὰ τὸν ἆθλον αὐτοῦ V: γεγιcτῶν ἄθλων αὐτοῦ R.

19-23

If Aristophanes' son, being beautiful and doing what fits his bodily form, has reached the peak of masculinity, —yet to travel further is not easy over the untrodden sea beyond the Pillars of Heracles, which the god-hero placed as renowned witnesses of the limit of seafaring.

19. εἰ δ'

The praise of the victor's extreme happiness is formulated in an εἰ clause. The sentence as a whole may be interpreted as containing a warning: 'Aristoclidas, you are beautiful, you do what befits your beauty, and you have exploited the best of those qualities a man competing in the games must have; you have, therefore, reachest the highest possible and do not have the ambition for more.'

• *Ei clauses; general:* The notion 'conditional', traditionally attached to εἰ,[79] is too limited. Preposed εἰ clauses are frequently used to introduce ideas that are not necessarily conditions in a logical sense. Here, the poet's purpose is not to restrict the validity of what is said in the main clause to a condition formulated in the εἰ clause; the εἰ clause formulates an observation in the light of which the thesis laid down in the main clause is to be understood.[80] In general, preposed εἰ clauses make for discontinuity; they open a new domain, introduce a new subject matter, or create a new frame-work for what is to follow. See also my notes on *N.*5.19, 50, pp. 127, 180. The present instance is exceptional to the extent that—in spite of εἰ δ' making for discontinuity—the subject matter of the preceding passage, direct praise of the victor, is continued.

• *Ei clauses imparting a warning to the victor:* There are quite a few examples in Pindar of εἰ clauses, where the protasis formulates a condition of extreme happiness, followed by an apodosis containing an expression of the sort *ne plus ultra.* These sentences are, as a rule, formulated in general terms ('If someone has reached A, B and C, he cannot go any further', or something similar). Of course, phrases of this kind are meant to be applicable to the victor, if they are meant to have any relevance at all. In fact, that they contain a warning and that they are, therefore, not the most pleasant phrases for the victor to hear, might account for their general formulation. In some cases the content is explicitly shown by the context to be applicable to the victor, either because a reference to the victor's happiness precedes

---

[79] Most recently by Gerry Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 3), Diss. Amsterdam 1994.

[80] Interpreting the protasis as a condition, which the poet is not certain about, is, of course, opposite to the aims of the genre.

the sentence (*N.*9.45-7), or because it directy follows it (*I.*6.7-16, *I.*5.12-6). In other passages the interpretation of the relevance of the conditional sentence to the victor is left to the audience (*O.*5.23/4, *N.*11.13-6). The peculiarity of the εἰ clause here is that it is specific. The subject is not an indefinite τιϲ, but the victor, mentioned by name. The other examples have in common that they formulate the victor's position in general terms, to which a warning is attached. The general thought accounts for the conditional formulation ('If someone is in the condition you are in, then he should ... '). See further interpretation, pp. 225-6.

• *Literature:* On this phenomenon, see Bundy's discussion of the "encomiastic conditional" in *Studia Pindarica*, pp. 54-62; Thummer, *Isthmische*, I pp. 77 ff.; Mader on *O.*5.23/4 (p. 98); Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 356 (§ 444). On conditional phrases in Pindar in general, see V. Bers, *Greek Poetic Syntax*, 148; B. Gildersleeve, 'Studies in Pindaric Syntax I: The Conditional Sentence in Pindar', *AJPh* 3, 1882, 438 ff.; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 349-56 (§§ 436-44). See also G.C. Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals*, Amsterdam 1994 (who does, however, not deal with Pindar).

19. ἐὼν καλὸϲ ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾶι

Throughout Greek aristocratic culture external appearance was of considerable importance. In Homer the notion of physical beauty is often combined with a reference to other laudible qualities, such as size, stature or skill.[81] There is reason to believe that during the course of the archaic period physical beauty came more and more to be associated with the aristocrat class.[82] It was considered an integral part of aristocratic ἀρετή. What a man looked like was regarded as a reliable index of his total worth. καλόϲ is what an ἀγαθόϲ looks like. So a καλόϲ man must[83] be an ἀγαθόϲ, a man of high birth, and can be expected to possess such qualities as are necessary to be victorious in the games.

Cf. *O.*8.19, *O.*9.94, *I.*7.21/2 *O.*10.99-105, *O.*9.65/6, *N.*11.13/4. In *P.*10.59 the victor is called νέαιϲίν τε παρθένοιϲι μέλημα, which may very well be taken as an indication of his physical attractiveness. Other poets: Hes.*Op.*714, Tyrt.10.9 W, Simon.*Epigr.*30 Page (149 B., 11 D.; see also my note on *P.*8.36), S.*El.*685-7 (also in an agonistic context: cf. Σ.*ad loc.*).

---

[81] Cf. e.g. *Od.*9.513-6, *Il.*6.156/7; combination with μέγαϲ: *Il.*18.518, 21.108, *Od.*1.301 (=3.199), 6.276, 13.289 (=16.158), 15.418. Cf. also *Il.*3.169 (γεραρόϲ), *Od.*8.310 (ἀρτίποϲ), *Od.*10.396 (μείζoνεϲ), *Od.*11.310 (μήκιϲτοι), *Il.*8.305 (δέμαϲ εἰκεῖα θεῇϲι), etc. In *Il.*2 Thersites' social inferiority and lack of ἀρετή are shown by his physical ugliness. However, there are some passages in Homer were physical beauty is not combined with ἀρετή (*Il.*3.44/5, 2.671-5).

[82] See Donlan, *AJPh* 94, 1973, pp. 369-72.

[83] For **ἐοικώϲ**, 'fitting', cf. *O.*1.35, *O.*4.25-7, *P.*3.59, *I.*5.24/5, etc.

The first occurrance of the *topos* might be Homer's description of Ajax in *Od.*11.550/1.

It is worth noticing that Pindar's references to male beauty are mostly restricted to odes for victors in the combat sports (exceptions being *N.*11.11-4, which is not an epinicion proper, and *P.*10.59, [double foot-race]). There is no reference to the beauty of victors in the equestrian events. This need not surprise us, for the palaestra is the traditional place for male beauty to be displayed and admired, whereas 'victors' in the equestrian events did hardly ever even partake themselves in the actual competition (as the emphatic reference in *I.*1.15 testifies). Moreover, it may be observed that Pindar links these references especially, but not exclusively, to παῖδες and ἀγένειοι (exceptions being *O.*9.94 [but cf. 89/90], *N.*11.11-4 [not an epinicion], *I.*7.21/2, and *h.l.*). The natural association between youth and beauty can be exemplified by *fr.*123. See further my 'Athletic Age Categories in Victory Odes.' Finally, it is noteworthy that references to the beauty of victors is entirely absent from Bacchylides. Pindar is stronger on the homo-erotic dimension than his contemporary, which places him more explicitly into aristocratic tradition.[84]

It is interesting to contrast these passages to the praise of the Theban pancratiast Melissus in *I.*4: τόλμᾱι γὰρ εἰκὼϲ | θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θηρῶν λεόντων | ἐν πόνωι, μῆτιν δ' ἀλώπηξ, αἰετοῦ ἅ τ' ἀναπιτναμένα ῥόμβον ἴϲχει· | χρὴ δὲ πᾶν ἔρδοντ' ἀμαυρῶϲαι τὸν ἐχθρόν. | οὐ γὰρ φύϲιν Ὠαριωνείαν ἔλαχεν· | ἀλλ' ὀνοτὸϲ μὲν ἰδέϲθαι, | ϲυμπεϲεῖν δ' ἀκμᾶι βαρύϲ. | καί τοί ποτ' Ἀνταίου δόμουϲ | Θηβᾶν ἄπο Καδμεϊᾶν μορφὰν βραχύϲ, | ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτοϲ, προϲπαλαίϲων ἦλθ' ἀνὴρ | τὰν πυροφόρον Λιβύαν ... | υἱὸϲ Ἀλκμήναϲ, ὃϲ Οὔλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, *I.*4.45-55. Surprisingly enough, Melissus is explicitly said to be ugly (ὀνοτὸϲ μὲν ἰδέϲθαι, 50: his appearence is to be 'scorned'; being short and being ugly is one and the same thing for a Greek). The following reference to Heracles' short stature, which did not refrain him from accomplishing more than anyone else, suggests that Pindar deliberately breaches the conventions and paradoxically makes a derogatory remark about the victor's appearance in order to draw a highly complimentary parallel between the victor and Heracles.

• *Literature:* On this idea, see: W. Donlan, 'The Origin of Καλὸϲ κἀγαθόϲ', *AJPh* 94, 1973, 365-74; Donlan, *Aristocratic Ideal*, p. 106/7; Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, p. 43; Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, pp. 15, 40, who describes the unity of outward appearance and inner qualities in terms of φυά; P. von der Mühl, 'Weitere pindarische Notitzen', *MH* 21, 1964,

[84] "No doubt Pindar, like most of his audience, was sexually attracted to boys, but the frequency of such compliments suggests that they are to be regarded rather as a traditional motif of aristocratic poetry, an heirloom from Anacreon, Ibycus, Theognis", Carey, *PCPS* n.s. 22, 1976, 26.

168-72; Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 4.22, 1969, 342/3; H. Wankel, *Kalos kai Agathos*, Diss. Würzburg 1961, 16-23. On the variations in the formulation of this *topos* in Pindar, see Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 187-91.

20. ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα

Aristoclidas has 'entered on the highest ἀνορέαι,' i.e., he has exploited the best of those qualities a man competing in the games must have. For the phrase cf. ἔςτι τις λόγος | τὰν 'Αρετὰν ναίειν δυςαμβάτοις' ἐπὶ πέτραις, | †νῦν δέ μιν θοαν† χῶρον ἁγνὸν ἀμφέπειν· | οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροιςι θνατῶν | ἔςοπτος, ᾧι μὴ δακέθυμος ἱδρὼς | ἔνδοθεν μόληι, | ἵκηι τ' ἐς ἄκρον ἀνδρείας, Sim.*fr.*37 D. (58 B., 386 Page). For 'height' as an image for superiority see my note on *P.*8.77 (p. 575). The noun **ἀνορέα** (cognate with ἀνήρ) refers to 'manliness,' to qualities like strength and courage necessary to be successful at the games or in war.

Cf. νῦν μὲν αὐτῶι γέρας 'Αλκιμέδων | νίκαν τρακοςτὰν ἑλών· | ὃς τύχαι μὲν δαίμονος, ἀνορέας δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακὼν | ἐν τέτραςιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοις | νόςτον ἔχθιςτον, *O.*8.65-9; τοῦ (*sc.* Aeacus) μὲν ἀντίθεοι | ἀρίςτευον υἱέες υἱέων τ' ἀρηΐφιλοι παῖδες ἀνορέαι | χάλκεον ςτονόεντ' ἀμφέπειν ὅμαδον, *I.*8.24/5a; *P.*8.88-91 (with my note, p. 592), *I.*4.11/2, *Pae.*9.44-6. Cf. also *Il.*8.226, *Il.*17.329/30, *Il.*4.303, 6.156, *Od.*24.509.

The verb **ἐπιβαίνω** may be used with an accusative, genitive or, more rarely, a dative object, meaning 'go upon, set foot upon,' i.e., either 'mounting' something high or 'entering' some area.

'Entering, set foot in': (acc.:) ἀλλ' ἁ Κοιογενὴς ὁπότ' ὠδίνεςςι θυίοις' ἀγχιτόκοις ἐπέβα νιν[85] (Delos), *fr.*33d.3-5; Ἥρη δ' ἀΐξαςα λίπεν ῥίον Οὐλύμποιο. | Πιερίην δ' ἐπιβᾶςα καὶ 'Ημαθίην ἐρατεινὴν | ςεύατ' ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων Θρηικῶν ὄρεα νιφόεντα, *Il.*14.225-7 (cf. also *Od.*5.50); τῶν ἄν κου ἐπιβέωμεν γῆν καὶ ἔθνος, τούτων τὸν ςῖτον ἕξομεν, Hdt.7.50; (gen.:) ἦ τοι ὁ μὲν χαίρων ἐπεβήςετο πατρίδος αἴης, *Od.*4.521 (middle: '*his* country'), cf. also *Il.*16.396, *Od.*9.83, 14.229; not with dative in this sense.

'Mounting, set foot upon': (acc.:) νῶθ' ἵππων ἐπιβάντες, Hes.*Sc.*286; (gen.:) οὐκ εἴξαντος ἐμεῖο | πύργων ἡμετέρων ἐπιβήςεαι οὐδὲ γυναῖκας | ἄξεις ἐν νήεςςι, *Il.*8.164-6; νεῶν ἐπιβαῖεν, *Il.*8.512; ἵππων ἐπιβάς, *Il.*5.328; δίφρου ἐπιβηςομένοιςιν, *Il.*23.379; (dat.:) ἐπειρῶντο ταῖς ἀλλήλων ναυςὶν ἐπιβαίνειν, Th.7.70; λὰξ ἐπίβα δήμωι κενεόφρονι, τύπτε δὲ κέντρωι | ὀξέϊ καὶ ζεύγλην δύςλοφον ἀμφιτίθει, Thgn.847/8; with a prep.: καὶ ἐπὶ τούτωι τῶι πύργωι ἄλλος πύργος ἐπιβέβηκε, Hdt.1.181.

From the *Odyssey* onwards, the verb is not unfrequently used metaphorically, with a personal subject and an abstract genitive object. In these cases the verb refers to the act of 'entering' a certain realm.

---

[85] ἐπιβαίνειν *v.l.*

Cf. τάων δώδεκα πᾶcαι ἀναιδείηc ἐπέβηcαν, | οὔτ' ἐμὲ τίουcαι οὔτ' αὐτὴν Πηνελόπειαν, *Od.*22.424/5, 'they have trodden the path of ἀναιδείη,' they have displayed it; ἀλλ' ἕπευ, ὄφρα cφῶι εὐφροcύνηc ἐπιβῆτον | ἀμφοτέρω φίλον ἦτορ, ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέποcθε, *Od.*23.52/3, 'enter into joy'; αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τέχνηc ἐπιβήcομαι ἥ τιc ἀρίcτη, *h.Merc.*166; αὐτὰρ ἐγώ coι | τέχνηc ἡμετέρηc ἐπιβήμεναι οὔ τι μεγαίρω, *h.Merc.*464/5; ἀμφὶ δὲ τιμῆc | κἀγὼ τῆc ὁcίηc ἐπιβήcομαι ἧc περ 'Απόλλων, *h.Merc.*172/3; ἄγε νυν cύ με, παῖ, | ἵν' ἂν εὐcεβίαc ἐπιβαίνοντεc | τὸ μὲν εἴποιμεν, τὸ δ' ἀκούcαιμεν, | καὶ μὴ χρείαι πολεμῶμεν, S.*OC* 188-91, "'entering on piety,' placing ourselves within its pale: but this figurative sense is here tinged with the notion 'entering on lawful ground'", Jebb *ad loc.*; λείπομεν ὑμᾶc, λείπομεν ἤδη, | δόξηc οὔ ποτε τῆcδ' ἐπιβάντεc, S.*Ph.*1462/3, "'entered on' that hope, —as upon ground which it was lawful to tread," Jebb *ad loc.*

The metaphorical use of the verb here is exceptional in two respects. It refers to the act of 'mounting,' rather than 'entering': the adjective ὑπερτάταιc activating that connotation; and it has a dative object instead of a genitive, the normal construction with the metaphorical sense of the verb. Aristoclidas has 'mounted on the highest ἀνορέαι,' i.e., he has exploited the best of those qualities a man competing in the games must have. The combination of 'mounting' and 'the highest' suggests that it was not a very easy thing to do for Aristoclidas.[86]

There are three more instances of ἐπιβαίνειν used metaphorically in Pindar. Cf. πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλών, *N.*1.18, probably: 'of many things I have set foot upon the due measure, not touching them with falsehood'[87]; ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόροc, *O.*2.95, 'yet against my praise surfeit advances' (transl. Bowra); ἐπὶ μὰν βαίνει τι καὶ λάθαc ἀτέκμαρτα νέφοc, | καὶ παρέλκει πραγμάτων ὀρθὰν ὁδὸν | ἔξω φρενῶν, *O.*7.45-7. The latter two are metaphorical in a higher degree than *h.l.*, since both subject and object are abstractions. The closest Pindaric parallel to the use of the verb here is: ἀλλ' ἔμπαν μεγαλανορίαιc ἐμβαίνομεν, | ἔργα τε πολλὰ μενοινῶντεc, *N.*11.44/5, though the reference is to 'embarking on plans,' instead of on accomplishments.

20. παῖc 'Αριcτοφάνεοc

The name of the victor's father is mentioned, one of the stock themes in the victory-ode. We do not have any independent evidence for the identity of Aristophanes. For the show release of oblig-

---

[86] Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, p. 155, suggests that the verb activates connotations of 'embarking' on a ship, thus preparing for the nautic images that are to follow. I doubt, however, whether the verb alone may activate these connotations, especially since ὑπερτάταιc suggests otherwise.

[87] See also Radt, *Mnemosyne* 19, 1966, 153. Braswell in his comm. *ad loc.* takes only πολλῶν as the object of ἐπέβαν ('having embarked on many themes'), rendering καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλών as 'I have not touched the occasion with falsehood'. I doubt whether καιρόc may have this meaning. See also Carey *ad loc.* (p. 109).

ate information, which effects some sort of suspense, see my introduction, pp. 41/2.

20-21. οὐκ ἔτι πρόcω | ἀβάταν ἅλα κιόνων ὕπερ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρέc

'Yet to travel further over the untrodden sea beyond the Pillars of Heracles is not easy.' οὐκ must be taken with εὐμαρέc, both words together forming a *litotes*. ἔτι πρόcω, 'yet further,' goes with περᾶν.

Word order allows also another interpretation, taking οὐκέτι together with εὐμαρέc, which results in 'then it is no longer easy to travel further, beyond the Pillars' (instead of: 'yet to travel further is not easy'). Contrast: οὐκ ἔcτι πρόcωθεν θνατὸν ἔτι cκοπιᾶc ἄλλαc ἐφάψαcθαι ποδοῖν, *N.*9.47, where word order explicitly excludes the connection of οὐκ with ἔτι. However, taking ἔτι with πρόcω here, as modifying περᾶν, gives better sense, for the other option would suggest that everything up to this point was easy,[88] that it was easy for Aristoclidas to 'set foot upon the highest manhood,' which would detract of his achievement. One could consider to guide the reader in this interpretation by printing οὐκ ἔτι as two separate words.

εὐμαρέc comes as a surprise. One would expect something like δύνατον (cf. *O.*3.44/5, *N.*4.69, below). The postponement of εὐμαρέc to the very end of the sentence adds to the ἀπροcδόκητον. The sentence turns out to be a *litotes* only with its very last word.

•*Pillars of Heracles:* The Pillars of Heracles are a familiar image in Pindar for the boundary beyond which a mortal cannot pass.

Cf. ἀνορέαιc δ' ἐcχάταιcιν | οἴκοθεν cτάλαιcιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαιc· | καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν cπεύδειν ἀρετάν, *I.*4.11-3; νῦν δὲ πρὸc ἐcχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖcιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέοc cταλᾶν. τὸ πόρcω δ' ἐcτὶ cοφοῖc ἄβατον | κἀcόφοιc. οὔ νιν διώξω· κεινὸc εἴην, *O.*3.43-5. In these passages the image serves a double purpose. It visualizes the thought that fame is carried all over the world. The Cleonymidae, and Theron 'reach'[89] from their own houses to the end of the world. Second, mentioning the Pillars of Heracles evokes the thought *ne plus ultra.* Theron, like the Cleonymidae, has reached the maximum and must therefore be content. In other words, the formulation of the wide impact of fame in terms of the Pillars of Heracles involves a warning not to try and attain more. But, in *O.*3, by using the *first* person future διώξω the poet also applies the maxim to himself. His praise of Theron has reached the point of *ne plus ultra* and he will not go on and praise him any further. The poem ends.

In Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸc ζόφον οὐ περατόν, *N.*4.69, following upon a description of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, the *gnome* has a slightly different function. Perhaps it also implicitly suggests that Peleus has reached the

---

[88] See also my note on *N.*5.50 μηκέτι, p. 182.

[89] For ἅπτεται see comm. on *N.*5.42 ἐψαύcαc, p. 172.

highest possible happiness[90]; the main purpose of the *gnome* is, however, that it serves as a break-off motif. After this the poet procedes: ἀπότρεπε | αὖτις Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρcον ἔντεα ναόc· | ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ | παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελθεῖν, 69-72, whereupon the poet turns to the praise of the victor. So here the Pillars of Heracles mainly serve as an image visualizing the turning point of Pindar's thematic conduct.

The image here bears close resemblance to *O*.3.43-5 and *I*.4.11-3: here, too, the image visualizes that the victor has reached the highest possible achievement. Here, however, the warning involved is left implicit. To this *gnome* Pindar attatches a short account of Heracles' deeds (22-6). Subsequently this is broken off with a reference to this *gnome:* θυμέ, τίνα πρὸc ἀλλοδαπὰν | ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβειc; (26/7), after which the poet returns to the Aeacids, the local Aeginetan heroes. Why praise a foreign cape, when we are to praise Aegina? (*v.i.*, comm. *ad loc.*). So when the function of the image of the Pillars of Heracles *h.l.* is compared to *O*.3.43-5 and *I*.4.11-3 on the one hand, and to *N*.4.69-72 on the other, it may be concluded that we here have a combination of both strategies. It has in common with both former instances that it serves as an image visualizing the thought that the victor has reached the highest possible goal, and with the latter that the poet uses it as a thematical break-off motif.

It is interesting to note that there are a number of places where Pindar, formulating the *ne plus ultra* motif, does not explicitly mention the Pillars of Heracles, but uses nautical terminology which is, at least, reminiscent of them. Cf. οὐκ ἔcτι πρόcωθεν θνατὸν ἔτι cκοπιᾶc ἄλλαc ἐφάψαcθαι ποδοῖν, *N*.9.47; ἐcχατιαῖc ἤδη πρὸc ὄλβου | βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμοc ἐών, *I*.6.12/3; περαίνει πρὸc ἔcχατον | πλόον, *P*.10.28/9. For a complete inventory of passages containing the *ne plus ultra* motif, see Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 191-5.

The Pillars of Heracles are mentioned as tokens of the limit of seafaring in Ἑcπερίδων δ' ἐπὶ μηλόcπορον ἀκτὰν | ἀνύcαιμι τᾶν ἀοιδῶν, | ἵν' ὁ πορφυρέαc ποντομέδων λίμναc | ναύταιc οὐκέθ' ὁδὸν νέμει, | cεμνὸν τέρμονα κυρῶν | οὐρανοῦ, τὸν Ἄτλαc ἔχει, E.*Hipp*.742-7. The Pillars are connected with Heracles' Tenth Labour, the fetching of Geyon's cattle from Erythea.[91] See further: Str.3.5.5/6, Apollod.2.5.10, D.S.4.18.5, Tz. *Lycophr*.649, Plin.*NH* 2.242, 3.4, Sen.*HF* 235 ff., *HOet*.1240, Pomponius Mela 1.5.3, 2.6.6. For Heracles' Tenth Labour in general, see Hes. *Th*.287-94, 979-83, Hdt.4.8, Pl.*Grg*.484b, D.S.4.17/8, Paus.3.18.13,

---

[90] Thus also Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, p. 155.

[91] Cf. *fr*.169.4-8. This island is also called Γάδειρα, cf. Hdt.4.8, Str.3.2.11, 3.5.4, Plin.*NH* 4.120, Solinus 23.12; cf. also *N*.4.69 (*v.s.*) and εἰc Πύλαc Γαδειρίδαc ... ὑcτάταc ἀφῖχθαι ... τὸν Ἡρακλέα, *fr*.256 (Str.3.5.5). To-day it is called Cádiz.

4.36.3, Apollod.2.5.10, Q.S.6.249 ff., Tz.*Chil.*2.322-52, Σ.*ad* Pl.*Tim.*24e, Plin.*NH* 4.120, Solinus 23.12, Servius *ad* Verg.*A.*8.300.

Similar symbols for the boundaries beyond which a mortal cannot pass are the Hyperboreans (*O.*3.31-2, *P.*10.28-30, *I.*6.22/3), the Nile (*N.*6.48-50), and the Ethiopians (*I.*2.39-42, *I.*6.22/3).

• *Semantics:* For **ὑπέρ** c. gen. with the sense 'beyond', cf. ἐὼν ἐγγὺς Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεταί μ᾽ ἀνὴρ | Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἁλὸς οἰκέων, *N.*7.64/5[92]; ἐν Κρήτηι εὐρείηι | τηλοῦ ὑπὲρ πόντου, *Od.*13.256/7; ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας τῆς ὑπὲρ Αἰγύπτου, Th.2.48, etc. See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 162 (§ 178). For **εὐμαρές** (ἐστι), 'it is easy', cf. *P.*3.115, *N.*11.33, Sapph.*fr.*16.5, 96.21 V., Sim.*Ep.*13.14.5, Thgn.845, E.*IA* 519, E.*fr.*176.2, E.*Alc.*492. For the adjective cf. also: A.*Suppl.*339, *Ag.*1326, S.*El.*179, Alc.*fr.*69.7 V., B.5.195-7. Cf. also the phrase ἐν εὐμαρεῖ, E.*Hel.*1227, *IA* 969. **ἄβατος**, 'untrodden' and, therefore, 'not to be trodden, impassable' occurs with the same reference in *O.*3.44 (cited above). Cf. further ὄρεα γὰρ ὑψηλὰ ἀποτάμνει ἄβατα, Hdt.4.25; cf. Hdt.7.176, S.*OT* 719, Str.5.4.5; of water: X.*An.*5.6.9; of holy places, 'not to be trodden': S.*OC* 167, 675, Pl.*La.*183b, Arist.*Pr.*924^{a}5, etc. For **περᾶν** in this specific context cf. Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν, *N.*4.69.

Strophe B

22. ἥρως θεός

A bold juxtaposition, semantically and syntactically. Pindar's usual practice is carefully to distinguish between the three categories, gods, heroes and men, in the fashion of τίνα θεόν, τίν᾽ ἥρωα, τίνα δ᾽ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; *O.*2.2. Especially the bounderies between mortal and immortal—i.e. between men and heroes on the one hand and gods on the other[93]—are closely heeded. Calling someone a 'god-hero' is therefore a striking *oxymoron.*

A ἥρως is a man with divine characteristics, either because one of his parents is divine, or because his achievements prove that he has them. Heracles is Zeus' son, and his deeds are unequalled by any mortal. So there is every reason to call him a ἥρως. Both because of his irresistible might and because of the richness of his 'legend,' Heracles is considered the ἥρως *par excellence.* The ground for calling him a god is his deification at his death. Heracles' immortal part was

---

[92] Unless the interpretation of Most, 'Pindar, *Nemean* 7, 64-67', *GRBS* 26, 1985, 330, is followed: 'dwelling on the hills overlooking the Ionian Sea'.

[93] Also in cult-practice this boundary was closely heeded, see, e.g., Farnell, *Hero Cults*, 95. The distinction between man and hero is sometimes disregarded, cf. e.g. *P.*2.29 and 31, where Ixion is called ἀνήρ and ἥρως in one and the same context. See also my note on *N.*5.4. εὐρυσθενής.

saved by Zeus from the pyre and born up to heaven, where he was accepted as one of the gods.

For reports of Heracles' apotheosis cf. e.g. D.S.4.38/8, Paus.3.18.7, Apollod.2.7.7, Hyginus, *Fabula* 102, Ov.*Met.*9.241ff., Tz.*Lycophr.*1349/50, etc. Pindar elsewhere refers to Heracles' happy life among the gods, without actually calling him a god: cf. *I.*4.55-60, where τετίματαί τε πρὸϲ ἀθανάτων φίλοϲ (59) is the closest one may get in referring to Heracles' divine status without in fact calling him a god; *N.*1.69-72, where τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον (69) implies something of an immortal status (cf. Hes.*Th.*955); *N.*10.17/8. Cf. also Hes.*Th.*950-5, Hes.*fr.*25.26-33, 229.6-13 M.-W., *h.Hom.*15.7/8. See also J.R. March, *The Creative Poet*, London 1987, 72/3. For the iconography of Heracles' apotheosis, including scenes on the Olympus, see A.-F. Laurens in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zürich 1981-9, 5.1, pp. 161-3, with illustrations in 5.2, pp. 149-51; F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*, Marburg 1973^3, 67/8; R. Vollkommer, *Heracles in the Art of Classical Greece*, Oxford 1988, 37-9.

There are a number of *testimonia* testifying that Heracles was in several communities bestowed with divine honours, and that he was considered to be both a hero and a god at the same time.

In the *Nekuia* we find the earliest reflection of this view. Heracles appears in the Hades leading the same shadowy and futile life as the ghosts of other dead men, while his real self lives happily married with Hebe on the Olympus: τὸν δὲ μέτ' εἰϲενόηϲα βίην Ἡρακληείην, | εἴδωλον· αὐτὸϲ δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοιϲι θεοῖϲιν | τέρπεται ἐν θαλίηϲ καὶ ἔχει καλλίϲφυρον Ἥβην, | παῖδα Διὸϲ μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρηϲ χρυϲοπεδίλου, *Od.*11.601-4. Cf. also Hes.*Th.*950-5. Herodotus advocates the view of the aboriginal divinity of Heracles. He believed him to have been one of the early twelve deities of Egypt, and according to his view the son of Amphitryon was a mortal born some thousands of years after him and named after the Egyptian god by his parents who were of Egyptian origin (Hdt.2.43-5). Cf. especially καὶ δοκέουϲι δέ μοι οὗτοι ὀρθότατα Ἑλλήνων ποιέειν, οἳ διχᾷ Ἡράκλεια ἱδρυϲάμενοι ἔκτηναν, καὶ τῶι μὲν ὡϲ ἀθανάτωι Ὀλυμπίωι δὲ ἐπωνυμίην θύουϲι, τῶι δὲ ἑτέρωι ὡϲ ἥρωι ἐναγίζουϲι, 2.44. According to Diodorus Siculus (4.38/9), the Athenians claimed to have been the first to honour Heracles as a god, and that the rest of the Greeks then followed their example Cf. also Paus.1.15.3. According to a Sicyonic legend, it was a Cretan called Phaestus who first persuaded the men of that territory to worship Heracles both as a hero and as a god, cf. Paus. 2.10.1. For a more detailed account of the origin and 'diffusion' of the cult of Heracles, his functions and the rituals performed in his honour, see L.R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, Oxford 1921, 95-174; see also J.E. Harrison, *Themis. A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion*, Cambridge 1912, 364-81; M.P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluß der attischen*, Leipzig 1906, 445-53. On the ambiguous status of Heracles see also N. Laaux, *Les expériences de Tiresias*, Paris 1989.

These *testimonia* prove that Pindar's description of Heracles as a 'god-hero' has a ground in sacrificial practice.[94]

As for syntax—juxtapositions like *h.l.*, with two asyndetically construed nouns, together referring to one and the same entity in reality, are not as such very uncommon. First, there are many examples of a noun like ἀνήρ or γυνή being used in combination with a noun specifying his or her status. This usage is common from epic onwards. These examples have in common that it easy to tell which one of both nouns is the more specific, the 'adjectivic' element.

Cf. e.g. γυνὴ δέcποινα, *Od.*7.347; ἄλοχοc δέcποινα, *Od.*3.403; ῥεῖα λαθὼν φύλακάc τ' ἄνδραc δμωιάc τε γυναῖκαc, *Il.*9.477; γυνὴ πάρθενοc, Hes.*Th.*514; ἀνὴρ μάντιc, Th.3.20; γραῦc γυνή, Ar.*Th.*345; ἀνὴρ ἄρχων, X.*Hier.*8.5; ἀνὴρ ῥήτωρ, D.18.282, etc. Also, sometimes contemptuously, with ἄνθρωποc, cf. ἀνθρώπουc ὑπογραμματέαc, Lys.30.28; but also more neutral, cf. ἄνθρωποc ὁδίτηc, *Il.*16.263; ἄνθρωποc ὑφάντηc, Pl.*Phd.*87b, etc. Cf, also πατρὶ γέροντι, *Il.*1.358; cάκοc εὐρὺ γέρον, *Od.*22.184; γέροντ' ὀφθαλμόν, E.*Or.*529. In Hesiod there is one example of an abstract noun qualifying ἀνήρ: μᾶλλον δὲ κακῶν ῥεκτῆρα καὶ ὕβριν | ἀνέρα τιμήcουcι, Hes.*Op.*191/2 (see West *ad loc.*). As a tendency, the more precise noun comes second, as a qualification of the first. *Il.*9.477 seems to be an exception, but there ἄνδραc and γυναῖκαc are contrasted.

This usage is extended by the tragic poets, who use the asyndetic juxtaposition of two nouns as an expressive effect. Especially Euripides seems to have been fond of this stylistic device. Here, too, it is quite clear which noun is the more specific, 'adjectivic' element.

Cf. παρθένου πηγῆc, A.*Pers.*613; ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χερὶ πράκτορι, A.*Ag.*111; ἀcπίcτοραc | κλόνουc, A.*Ag.*403/4; τύχη δὲ cωτήρ, A.*Ag.*664; βρωτῆραc αἰχμάc, A.*Eu.*803; τίνα πρὸc ξενίαν | ἢ δόμον ἢ χθόνα cωτῆρα κακῶν; E.*Med.*359/60 (cf. *Ph.*977); βροτῶν ἐν ἁλὸc ῥοθίοιc τιμὰc cωτῆραc ἔχοντεc, E.*El.*992/3; νεανίαc λόγουc | ῥίπτων, E.*Alc.*679/80; νεανίαν θώρακα καὶ βραχίονα, E.*HF* 1095; Νηρῆιδεc ... | μόχθουc ἀcπιcτὰc ἀκμόνων | Ἡφαίcτου χρυcέων ἔφερον τευχέων, E.*El.*442-4, 'carried the shield-toils of Hephaestus' anvil, consisting in golden arms' (Denniston *ad loc.*), referring to Achilles' shield; ὁπλίτην κόcμον, E.*Heracl.*699; ἐc παρθένουc γε χεῖραc, E.*Ion* 270; οἰκέτην βίον, E.*Ion* 1373; νηcιώτηc βίοc, E.*Rh.*701, etc. See also Kühner-Gerth, *Satzlehre*, Vol. I, pp. 272/3 (§ 405.1); Schwyzer-Debrunner, II, pp. 176, 613-5.

Not many parallels are found in Pindar: μάντιεc ἄνδρεc, *O.*8.2; ἅτε μάντιc ἀνήρ, *I.*6.51; μελιγαρύων τέκτονεc | κώμων νεανίαι, lines 4/5

---

[94] There is therefore no reason to suspect the reading of the MSS. P. Maas, 'ΗΡΩC ΘΕΟC', *MH* 11, 1954, 199 ("Das auffällige Oxymoron scheint ohne Parallele. Herakles war Heros, solange er lebte, Gott nach seinem Tod."), proposing the conjecture ἥρωc θεόc, discards the ambiguity of Heracles' nature as it appears from the testimonia quoted above. See also Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, p. 277, n. 2.

above; ἔν τ' ἀcπιδοδούποιcιν ὁπλίταιc δρόμοιc, *I.*1.23; τὸν αἰχματὰν κεραυνόν, *N.*9.37; θυμὸν αἰχματάν, *N.*9.37; μαχατὰν θυμόν, *N.*9.26; θρόνοc, ὧι ποτε Κρηθεΐδαc | ἐγκαθίζων ἱππόταιc εὔθυνε λαοῖc δίκαc, *P.*4.153/4 (cf. A.*Th.*80, S.*OC* 898/9, E.*Supp.*660).

ἥρωc θεόc is exceptional because here we are not dealing with a general noun, juxtaposed to a more specific one that performs the role of an adjective: here we have two equally specific nouns—even mutually exclusive nouns, that is —, and we have no means of telling which one specifies the other. Heracles is a 'god-hero,' or a 'hero-god.' It is clear that this eye-catching qualification is meant to emphasize Heracles' exceptional status. The hero with whom Aegina has a special bond is not just a hero who is a dime a dozen, but the one and only hero with divine stature. See further interpretation, pp. 227/8.

22. ἅc

For the structuring function of the relative see introduction, pp. 37-41. The postponement of the relative adds prominence to the in itself highly unusual expression ἥρωc θεόc.

For examples of hyperbaton involving the relative, cf. *O.*1.12, 82, 2.8, 33, 5.12, 6.85, 8.76, 9.34, 13.31, *P.*1.74, 2.5, 3.89, 4.10, 30, 246, 5.10, 41, 6.50, 9.44, *N.*1.28, 6.31, 7.90, *I.*1.13, 4.47, *fr.*12. Cf. also B.11.124, 14b.2. On hyperbaton see further J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, Oxford 1952, 48/9; P. Chantraine, 'Les recherches sur l' ordre des mots en grec', *Anales de Filología Clásica* 5, 1950/2, 72-80 (esp. 79/80); Van Leeuwen, *Tweede Olympische*, II pp. 417/8 (n. 75).

22. ἔθηκε

The choice of this verb with a double accusative in the given word-order (the verb coming before the second accusative noun-phrase) results in an ambivalent expression. When the hearer hears ἔθηκε, he will in the first instance interpret this as 'set up, erected.' The sentence could be complete at this point. Only with the accusative noun phrase that follows (ναυτιλίαc ἐcχάταc μάρτυραc κλυτάc) the possibility of interpreting the sentence as 'made them the renowned witnesses of the furthest possible voyage' comes to the hearer's mind. In fact Heracles did both, he set up the Pillars and made them a sign indicating the limit of seafaring.

For τίθημι with a single acc., in the sense of 'setting up, building,' cf. e.g. εἰ δέ τοι | μάτρωι μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύειc | cτάλαν θέμεν, *N.*4.79-81; Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε Παρναccοῦ καταβάντε | δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, *O.*9.43/4; κελήcατό νιν ... | θέμεν Ἱππίαι βωμὸν εὐθὺc Ἀθάναι, *O.*13.80-2, etc. For τίθημι with a double acc., 'make', cf. e.g. Ἀλκιμέδοντα δὲ πὰρ Κρόνου λόφωι | θῆκεν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν (*sc.* Zeus), *O.*8.17/8, etc. The ambivalent word-order may be compared to: ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόcωπον | χρὴ θέμεν

τηλαυγές, *O*.6.3/4. Cf. also the zeugmatic use of the verb in: ἐθελήϲαϲ ταῦτα νόωι τιθέμεν εὔανδρόν τε χώραν, *P*.1.40, 'take those things to heart and make this a land of brave men'; Μῶϲ' ἄγε Καλλιόπα, θύγατερ Διόϲ, | ἄρχ' ἐρατῶν ϝεπέων, ἐπὶ δ' ἵμερον | ὕμνωι καὶ χαρίεντα τίθη χορόν, Alcm.*fr*.27 Da., 'endow the hymn with longing (i.e., make it lovely) and render the chorus charming.'

22-23. ναυτιλίαϲ ἐϲχάταϲ | μάρτυραϲ κλυτάϲ

The Pillars of Heracles are the 'renowned witnesses, the famous tokens' of the 'limit of seafaring, the furthest possible voyage.' The reference of ναυτιλίαϲ ἐϲχάταϲ includes Heracles' voyage to the end of the world as well as 'the point beyond which a man cannot sail' in general. The metaphor μάρτυραϲ, standing for a word like 'tokens' or 'landmarks', presents the Pillars as the 'witnesses' of Heracles' voyage in the past, standing where he stood. Additionally, it is relevant that a witness may give an authorative account of what he has witnessed; he is an authority telling something which from his mouth is very likely to be the truth. This holds true for the Pillars of Heracles, too, since they are, with a high degree of authority, telling the sailors that they have reached the furthest possible point.

κλυτόϲ, 'heard of,' i.e., 'spoken about,' 'famous, renowned,' is used frequently as a qualification of gods (*P*.3.92, 9.59, *Il*.9.362, B.16.7, 101, etc.) and heroes (*Il*.20.320, *Od*.24.409, etc.), and perhaps even more frequently of places, such as cities, regions, sanctuaries, bays, etc. (*P*.11.32, *O*.9.19, *fr*.198a.2/3, *P*.1.37, *Il*.24.437, *Od*.6.321/2, *Od*.10.87, S.*Ant*.1118, E.*IA* 263/4, etc.). This familiar usage is an argument for taking κλυτάϲ to be an accusative qualifying the landmarks, rather than a genitive qualifying the voyage. Then, ἐϲχάταϲ must be a genitive rather than an accusative, which results in a balanced distribution of one adjective for each noun and gives excellent sense.[95]

Bury (*ad loc.*, pp. 49/50) interprets κλυτᾶϲ, as a attributive genitive with ναυτιλίαϲ, taking ἐϲχάταϲ as a plural accusative with the relative pronoun. Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 256) takes ναυτιλίαϲ ἐϲχάταϲ together as a genitive singular, leaving κλυτάϲ as a qualification of μάρτυραϲ. "There is no difficulty in this word here being feminine, as it is in apposition to a feminine." Farnell's latter observation is directed against scholars like Wilamowitz, who conjectured κλυτούϲ.[96] ὅϲτιϲ δ' ἀλιτὼν ὥϲπερ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ | χεῖραϲ φονίαϲ ἐπικρύπτει, | μάρτυρεϲ ὀρθαὶ τοῖϲι θανοῦϲιν | παραγιγνόμεναι

---

[95] Thus also Σ.*ad h.l.* (38b, III 47 Dr.): ἅϲτιναϲ ϲτήλαϲ ὁ ἥρωϲ καὶ θεὸϲ Ἡρακλῆϲ τῆϲ τελευταίαϲ ναυτιλίαϲ καὶ τοῦ ἐϲχάτου πλοῦ ἔϲτηϲε περιφανέϲτατα ϲημεῖα.

[96] Cf. *O*.1.33, where, however, part of the MSS. tradition is in favour of a feminine form. See Gerber *ad loc.* (p. 69). See also Postgate, *Mnemosyne* 1925, 383.

πράκτορες αἵματος | αὐτῶι τελέως ἐφάνημεν, A.*Eum.*316-20, proves that Farnell is right on this point. Cf. also πιστὰ δ' Ἀγασικλέει μάρτυς ἤλυθον ἐς χορόν, *fr.*94b.38/9, sung by a chorus of girls.

For **μάρτυς**, 'witness,' cf. καί τοι μοναρχεῖν | καὶ βασιλευέμεν ὄμνυμι προήσειν. καρτερὸς | ὅρκος ἄμμιν μάρτυς ἔστω Ζεὺς ὁ γενέθλιος ἀμφοτέροις, *P.*4.165-7; ἀψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλῶσσαν. | εἴ τι καὶ φλαῦρον παραιθύσσει, μέγα τοι φέρεται | πὰρ σέθεν. πολλῶν ταμίας ἐσσί· πολλοὶ μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροις πιστοί, *P.*1.86-8; τεαὶ γὰρ Ὧραι | ... μ' ἔπεμψαν | ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ' ἀέθλων, *O.*4.1-3, where Pindar calls himself a 'witness' to the games, since he will, with the authority based on him being an eye-witness, give a true record of who was victorious.[97] Cf. also the much disputed passage οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ, *N.*7.49, where ὁ μάρτυς probably refers to Pindar or Apollo.[98] For the metaphorical use of the noun cf. Χάρις δ', ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύχει τὰ μείλιχα θνατοῖς, | ἐπιφέροισα τιμὰν καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστὸν | ἔμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις· | ἁμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι | μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι, *O.*1.30-4; "the basic idea in these verses is that Charis' power to make the incredible seem credible is only temporary, since time will reveal the truth. Combined with this, however, are two equally common ideas, that of the poet as 'witness' and the poet as σοφός," Gerber *ad* lines 33-4 (p. 67). In πιστοὶ χορευτᾶν μάρτυρες, *P.*12.27, the expression refers to the δόνακες mentioned in line 25, the reeds that become flutes, accompanying the dancing. For **ναυτιλία**, 'voyage', cf. *P.*4.70 (of the Argonauts), *I.*4.57 (of Heracles), *Od.*8.252/3, Hdt.1.1, etc.

23-26

He subdued the superior beasts in the sea, and, by himself, he searched for the currents in the shallows, by which way he arrived at his goal, which send him home, and he made the earth known.

23-25 Mythological background

•*Heracles clearing the sea:* Heracles made the seas navigable by killing the monsters of the sea and by finding the channels in the shallows. This 'cleansing' of the sea is mentioned in some authors, who usually only outline it in general terms. It never became a canonical labour. Pindar connects the finding of the channels with the cleansing of the sea in: υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας· ὃς Οὔλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, γαίας τε πάσας | καὶ βαθύκρημνον πολιᾶς ἁλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ, | ναυτιλίαισί τε πορθμὸν ἡμερώσαις, *I.*4.55-7. Sophocles mentions the 'cleansing' of both sea and land in: πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πόντωι κατὰ δὲ δρία πάντα καθαίρων, *Tr.*1012. Euripides speaks of the ποντίων καθαρμάτων in *HF* 225; this

---

[97] Cf. also καὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμόσσαις τοῦτό γέ οἱ σαφέως | μαρτυρήσω· μελίφθογγοι δ' ἐπιτρέψοντι Μοῖσαι, *O.*6.20/1. Cf. also *fr.*94b.39, cited above.

[98] See Tugendhat, *Hermes* 88, 1960, 396 n. 1; Carey, *Five Odes*, pp. 154/5.

is mentioned more fully in: ποντίας θ' ἁλὸς μυχοὺς | εἰσέβαινε, θνατοῖς | γαλανείας τιθεὶς ἐρετμοῖς, *ibid.*400-2. Cf. also ἦν γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅλων ἡ βουλή, ὅπως κοσμηθείη τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πράγματα καὶ γῆ καὶ θάλαττα ἐνεργὰ καταστατίη. καὶ γίγνεται δὴ οὕτως Ἡρακλῆς συνεργὸς τῶι πατρὶ καὶ ὕπαρχος τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν τῆς σελήνης πόλον, καὶ τὰ σημεῖα εὐθὺς ἠκολούθησεν, Aristid.*Or.*40.2 (Keil).

• *The monsters of the sea:* Pindar mentions the killing of sea monsters also in: ὁ (*sc.* Τειρεσίας) δέ οἱ (*sc.* Ἀμφιτρύωνι) φράζε καὶ παντὶ στρατῶι, ποίαις ὁμιλήσει τύχαις, | ὅσσους μὲν ἐν χέρσωι κτάνων | ὅσσους δὲ πόντωι θῆρας ἀϊδροδίκας, *N.*1.61-3. Homer mentions the killing of a sea monster near Troy in *Il.*20.144-8 (cf. Σ.*ad N.*1.63). For the tradition of monsters living near and beyond the Pillars, see Avienus, *Ora Maritima,* (4) 406 ff. Heracles set up the Pillars in the course of his Tenth Labour; Apollodorus (2.5.10) explicitly connects the killing of monsters with this labour. Diodorus Siculus (4.17.3, cf. *ibid.*5) says that Heracles completely cleared Crete of wild beasts before he set sail to Erythea.[99]

• *The shallows by and beyond the Pillars:* The shallows beyond the Pillars of Heracles are described by the geographer Scylax (§ 112). Avienus, in his *Ora Maritima,* also mentions these shallows, both by and beyond the straits ([4] 362-5, 375-80, 406-7, citing, apart from Scylax, Euctemon and the Carthaginian Himilko), and connects them with Heracles bringing back the cattle of Geryon from Erythea to Eurystheus in the course of his Tenth Labour. This is in keeping with what the Suda tells us (*s.v.* ἕρματα): ὁ δὲ Ἡρακλῆς ἕρματα μεγάλα ἔβαλεν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ, ὡς ἂν ἐμπόδια εἴη τοῖς ἐπιφοιτῶσι θηρίοις. This indicates that some tradition existed connecting Heracles, the shallows near the Pillars and the theft of the cattle of Geryon. However, Pindar did not think of Heracles using the shallows as stepping stones; on the contrary, he is looking for the currents between them.

• *Literature:* G.W. Bond, *Euripides Heracles,* Oxford 1981, 168/9 (comm. on 400-2); F. Brommer, *Heracles II: Die unkanonischen Taten des Helden,* Darmstadt 1984, 60-3; R. Volkommer, *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece* (*Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Monograph N° 25*), Oxford 1988, 30. On the treatment of the Heracles theme in Pindar and others, see further especially: K. Galinsky, *The Herakles Theme,* Oxford 1972; J.R.

[99] Alternatively, the killing of the monsters of the sea is connected with Heracles' victory over Triton, who is situated in the Great Syrte, a dangerous area on the Lybian coast, near Euesperides, where there is a Τριτωνὶς λίμνη (cf. Str.17.3.20; Plin.*NH* 5.5; see also *RE* VII A 253 ff.). This fight is portrayed on one of the archaic pedimens on the acropolis at Athens (see e.g. G. Richter, *Sculpture and Sculptors,* 120, plate 379). There are other pictures of Heracles fighting sea or river monsters, like the stamnos by Oltos (see Beazley, *ARV* 2, 54.5).

March, *The Creative Poet. Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry* (*BICS Supplement* 49), London 1987; W. Mullen, 'The Herakles Theme in Pindar', *Herakles: Passage of the Hero through 1,000 Years of Classical Art* (J.P. Uhlenbach ed.), New Rochelle (N.Y.) 1986; D.L. Pike, 'Pindar's Treatment of the Heracles Myths', *Acta* 27, 1984, 15-22; C. Platter, 'Heracles, Deianeira, and Nessus: Reverse Chronology and Human Knowledge in Bacchylides 16', *AJPh* 115, 1994, 337-349; M.S. Silk, 'Heracles in Greek Tragedy', *G&R* 32, 1985, 1-22.

23-24. δάμαcε δὲ θῆραc ἐν πελάγεϊ | ὑπερόχουc

Heracles 'subdued the superior beasts in the sea'. Cf. *N.*1.61-3 (cited above). **ὑπέροχοc**, 'superior,' i.e., 'excelling, outdoing,' in general is used as a positive qualification with the sense 'prominent, distinguished.'

Pindar uses the adjective once more: εἶδοc γὰρ ὑπεροχωτάται πρέπεν Οὐρανιᾶν | θυγατέρι Κρόνου, *P.*2.38/9, of Hera, the most prominent goddess of all. Cf. also πέμπε δέ μ' ἐc Τροίην καί μοι μάλα πόλλ' ἐπέτελλεν | αἰὲν ἀριcτεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων, *Il.*6.207/8, cf. 11.784; Ἥρην ἀείδω χρυcόθρονον ἣν τέκε 'Ρείη, | ἀθανάτην βαcίλειαν ὑπείροχον εἶδοc ἔχουcαν, *h.Hom.*12.1/2; τοὺc ὑπερόχουc τῶν ἀcτῶν φονεύειν, Hdt.5.92η; ὑπέροχον cθένοc, A.*Pr.*428, with reference to Atlas' strength; κλύε δ' ἄμεμπτον εὐχὰν μεγαcθενὴ[c] Ζεύc, ὑπέροχόν τε Μίνωϊ φύτευcε τιμὰν φίλωι θέλων | παιδὶ πανδερκέα θέμεν, B.17.67-70. In [cεύον]το γὰρ cὺν ὑπερόχωι τε Νίκαι | [cὺν 'Αγ]λαΐαι τε (*sc.* Hieron's horses), B.3.5/6, Nika is called ὑπέροχοc, because victory is, by definition, the result of a man's (or a horse's) superiority over his competitors. Cf. also ὑπερέχω, 'to be prominent above, to be superior,' *Il.*3.210, Thgn.201/2, A.*Pers.*709, etc.

The use of the adjective as a qualification of the sea monsters is striking, first because the denotation of the adjective, 'superior,' is in the same sentence proved to be diametrically opposed to the facts, second because, if the adjective is interpreted metaphorically as 'monstrous,[100] awful,' this is the only occurrance where it is a negative qualification. This is the more striking, since the adjective is given emphasis by means of its placement, with hyperbaton as well as enjambement, supplementary to an utterance that is in itself syntactically complete. Emphasis on the superiority of the monsters illustrates Heracles' exceptional accomplishment, thus adding to his glory. The suggestion is that the monsters indeed were superior, i.e., invincible for all—except for Heracles.

The choice of the aorist **δάμαcε** here is to be explained in terms of the structure of the narrative. The story about Heracles is related in a series of sentences all containing an aorist (ἔθηκε, 22; δάμαcε, 23;

---

[100] Thus Slater *s.v.*

ἐρεύνασε, 24, see next note; φράδασε, 26. For the imperfect κατέβαινε, 25, see my note, pp. 300/1). Each action is presented as an independent step in the narrative.

For δαμάζω as an euphemism for 'killing,' cf., e.g., δαμεῖσα χρυσέοις | τόξοισιν ὑπ' Ἀρτέμιδος | εἰς Ἀΐδα δόμον ἐν θαλάμωι κατέβα, *P.*3.9-11; πέφνε Κτέατον ἀμύμονα, | πέφνε δ' Εὔρυτον ... λόχμαισι δὲ δοκεύσαις ὑπὸ Κλεωνᾶν δάμασε καὶ κείνους Ἡρακλέης ἐφ' ὁδῶι, *O.*10.27-30; *P.*8.17, *N.*7.90, *P.*3.35, etc. For the verb used of athletic victory see my note on *P.*8.79/80 (p. 578).

• *Text:* The mss. read ὑπέροχος, ἰδίαι τ' ἐρεύνασε, which does not scan. The metre can be restored by interpreting ΥΠΕΡΟΧΟΣ as ὑπερόχο̄ς, spelled ὑπερόχους according to modern conventions.[101] Since Pindar himself could not make the difference between a sort and a long o in writing, the reading ὑπερόχους is fully supported by the maniscriptual evidence.

The Σ.*ad loc.* (42b, III 48 Dr.) is familiar with a different reading: τὸ δὲ ἰδίαι τ' ἐρεύνασεν ἔνιοι γράφουσι διά[102] τ' ἐρεύνασε, διηρεύνησέ τε. This entails an ancient *varia lectio* which is, however, metrically incorrect. The MSS. reading, interpreted as ὑπερόχους, κτλ is therefore to be preferred. Nevertheless, Boeckh and Hermann adopted this *varia lectio* and restored the metre by conjecturing ὑπέροχος, διά τ' ἐξερεύνασε,[103] adopted by Fennell, and ὑπέροχος, διά τ' αὖτ' ἐρεύνασε respectively. The attractiveness of these conjectures is, of course, that they result in ὑπέροχος being a qualification of Heracles, which is semantically less disturbing (*v.s.*).

24-25. ἰδίαι τ' ἐρεύνασε τεναγέων | ῥοάς

'And by himself he searched for the currents in the shallows.' Cf. υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας· ὃς Οὔλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, γαίας τε πάσας | καὶ βαθύκρημνον πολιᾶς ἁλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ, | ναυτιλίαισί τε πορθμὸν ἡμερώσαις, *I.*4.55-7. The τεναγέων ῥοαί are those places in the shallows that are 'running, flowing,' where a ship does not run aground. By means of ἰδίαι it is emphasized that Heracles searched for them 'by himself,' that he did it alone, without anyone helping him.[104] The self-reliance of heroes is

---

[101] Thus Moschopulos.

[102] B: δία D: δία *sive* δύα *sive* δυΐα P.

[103] The compound *διεξερευνάω is only attested in the middle (Pl.*Lg.*763a, cf. *Phlb.*58d).

[104] Thus Bury *ad loc.* (p. 50). ἰδίαι is explained by the Σ.*ad h.l.* (42c, III 48/9 Dr.) as 'on his own initiative', i.e. not having been ordered by Eurysteus: οὐκέτι προστάξαντος Εὐρυσθέως, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὸ φιλόπονον αὐτοῦ διηρεύνησεν. The same scholion quotes χαῖρε βαρυσκίπων, ἐπιτακτὰ μὲν ἑξάκι δοιά, | ἐκ δ' αὐταγρεσίης πολλάκι πολλὰ καμών, Call.*fr.*120. These uncanonical labours were called πάραθλα, according to the scholiast. Barrett (on E.*Hipp.*744/5, p. 304) connects this phrase with the eleventh labour, the Apples of the Hesperides, and taking it as "Pindar's correction of current legend to the credit of his favourite Herakles: he found the channels *on his own*, and not, as the story is told, with Nereus' help" (cf.

a running theme in this ode. See interpretation, pp. 201, 203, 207, 212, 215/6, 230. For the tradition of the shallows by and beyond the Pillars, and for the tradition of Heracles finding his way through them, see above (pp. 294-6).

The use of the adverb **ἰδίαι** in the sense of 'on one's own, by oneself' (as opposed to 'together with others', not in the sense of 'privately', as opposed to 'publicly') may be compared to a passage in Euripides' *Ion:* (The chorus prophesies that Creusa will never have a child (760-2); weep and wail (763-8), and then:) [Old man to Creusa:] μήπω cτενάξηις ... | πρὶν ἂν μάθωμεν ... | εἰ ταὐτὰ πράccων δεcπότηc τῆc cυμφορᾶc | κοινωνόc ἐcτιν, ἢ μόνη cὺ δυcτυχεῖc. | [Chorus replies to the old man:] κείνωι μέν, ὦ γεραιέ, παῖδα Λοξίαc | ἔδωκεν, ἰδίαι δ' εὐτυχεῖ ταύτηc δίχα, E.*Ion* 769-775; ἰδίαι here must mean 'alone'; it has the same reference as ταύτηc δίχα, being opposed to κοινωνόc. Cf. also: ἰδίαι δέ, μή τι πᾶcι, χωρίcαc ποτόν, E.*Ion* 1035, 'for him alone'. In: [Clythaemnestra to Achilles:] αἰcχύνομαι δὲ παραφέρουc' οἰκτροὺc λόγουc, | ἰδίαι νοcοῦcα· cὺ δ' ἄνοcοc κακῶν γ' ἐμῶν, E.*IA* 981/2, ἰδίαι denotes that Clythaemnestra's troubles do not concern Achilles.[105] To my knowledge *h.l.* is the earliest occurrance of the adverb ἰδίαι.

For the adjective cf. further Βαccίδαιcιν ἅ τ' οὐ cπανίζει, παλαίφατοc γενεά, | ἴδια ναυcτολέοντεc ἐπικώμια, Πιερίδων ἀρόταιc | δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων | ἕνεκεν, *N.*6.31-4; ἐγὼ δὲ ἴδιοc ἐν κοινῶι cταλεὶc | μῆτίν τε γαρύων παλαιγόνων | πόλεμόν τ' ἐν ἡρωΐαιc ἀρεταῖcιν | οὐ ψεύcομ' ἀμφὶ Κορίνθωι, *O.*13.49-52; ἀμέγαρτα γὰρ τάδε Ζεὺc ἰδίοιc νόμοιc κρατύνων ὑπερήφανον θεοῖc τοῖc πάροc ἐνδείκνυcιν αἰχμάν, A.*Pr.*402-5 (cf. παρ' ἑαυτῶι | τὸ δίκαιον ἔχων Ζεύc, *ibid.*186/7); Ζῆνα γὰρ οὐ τρομέων | ἰδίαι γνώμαι cέβηι θνατοὺc ἄγαν, Προμηθεῦ, *ibid.*542/3.[106]

For **τέναγοc** 'shoal-water, shallows'[107] cf. μέχριc ἵκοντο | προπρὸ μάλ' ἔνδοθι Cύρτιν, ἵν' οὐκέτι νόcτοc ὀπίccω | νηυcὶ πέλει, ὅτε τόνδε βιώιατο κόλπον ἱκέcθαι· | πάντη γὰρ τέναγοc, πάντη μνιόεντα βυθοῖο | τάρφεα, κωφὴ δέ cφιν ἐπιβλύει ὕδατοc ἄχνη, A.R.4.1234-8 (cf. *ibid.* 1264), Hdt.1.202, 7.176, 8.129, etc.

The *Aktionsart* of **ἐρευνάω**, 'seek, search for', is terminative: 'try to find', the finding being the natural end of the action. The aorist can

---

Apollod.2.5.11, Hdt.7.124-7, Hyginus 2.15). The fact that Heracles set up the Pillars in the course of his Tenth Labour and the indication that some tradition existed connecting Heracles, the shallows near the Pillars and the theft of the cattle of Geryon (*v.s.*, comm. on 23-5), together with the fact that neither Nereus nor the Hesperides are mentioned, does not plead in favour of this hypothesis.

[105] F. Jouan (Budé text) translates: 'des maux qui ne sont qu'à moi'.

[106] The reading ἰδίαι γνώμαι here has, however, often been suspected. See Headlam, *JPh* 20, 294.

[107] Τέναγη δὲ λέγονται αἱ δίυγροι καὶ παραποτάμιοι ὀφρύεc, ἤτοι παρατεταμένη τιc καὶ ὑπερέχουcα γῆ οὖcα, Σ.*ad loc.* (43a, III 49 Dr.); ἰλὺc ἐπιπολάζοντοc ὕδατοc οὐ πολλοῦ, Suda *s.v.*, cf. also Polyb.1.75.

only be used when referring to a succesful action of searching. This explains the choice of the aorist here. Heracles' accomplishment was not that he 'searched for the currents between the shallows', but rather that he 'found' them.[108]

Aorists: τὸ κοινόν τιϲ ἀϲτῶν ἐν εὐδίαι Ι τιθεὶϲ ἐρευναϲάτω μεγαλάνοροϲ Ἡϲυχίαϲ τὸ φαιδρὸν φάοϲ, *fr.*109.1/2, one must 'place the common good of the citizens in good weather and thus find Tranquillity'; χρῶνται δὲ τοῖϲ μένουϲι τῶν ἐφήβων αἱ ἀρχαί, ἤν τι ἢ φρουρῆϲαι δεήϲηι ἢ κακούργουϲ ἐρευνῆϲαι ἢ ληιϲτὰϲ ὑποδραμεῖν ἢ καὶ ἄλλο τι ὅϲα ἰϲχύοϲ ἢ τάχουϲ ἔργα ἐϲτί, X.*Cyr.*1.2.12, it is necessary to 'find' scoundrels rather than to 'look for' them. Cf. also: (Agaue:) τὸ φίλτατον δὲ ϲῶμα ποῦ παιδόϲ, πάτερ; Ι (Cadmos:) ἐγὼ μόλιϲ τόδ' ἐξερευνήϲαϲ φέρω, E.*Ba.*1298/9, the success of the act of 'searching' resulting in φέρω; μόνοϲ δὲ νοϲτῶ, τοῖϲ ἐκεῖ ζητῶν φίλοιϲ Ι τὰ πρόϲφορ' ἤν πωϲ ἐξερευνήϲαϲ λάβω, E.*Hel.*428/9, the success of the act of 'searching' resulting in λάβω. Present tense stem forms and futures: καὶ πᾶϲαν κατὰ Ι Ἑλλάδ' εὑρήϲειϲ ἐρευνῶν μάϲϲον' (*sc.* victories) ἢ ὡϲ ἰδέμεν, *O.*13.112/3; [τ]υφλα[ὶ γὰ]ρ ἀνδρῶν φρένεϲ, Ι [ὅ]ϲτιϲ ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων Ι βαθεῖαν ε..[..].ων ἐρευνᾶι ϲοφίαϲ ὁδόν, *Pae.*7b.18-20; οὐ γὰρ ἔϲθ' ὅπωϲ τὰ θεῶν Ι βουλεύματ' ἐρευνάϲει βροτέαι φρενί, *fr.*61.3/4; πολλὰ δέ τ' ἄγκε ἐπῆλθε μετ' ἀνέροϲ ἴχνι' ἐρευνῶν Ι εἴ ποθεν ἐξεύροι, *Il.*18.321/2; πρὸ δ' ἄρ' αὐτῶν Ι ἴχνι' ἐρευνῶντεϲ κύνεϲ ἤϊϲαν, *Od.*19435/6; μήποτε τὸν παρεόντα μεθεὶϲ φίλον ἄλλον ἐρεύνα, Thgn.1151 (1238a). Cf. further *Od.*22.180, *h.Cer.*163, *h.Merc.*176, A.*Pr.*1038, S.*Ant.*268, *OT* 725, E.*Med.*669, 1084, 1318, *Hec.*1174, *Ion* 1213, Hdt.5.92 δ, 7.19, Pl.*Ap.*23b, 41b, *Tht.*200e, etc.

For the *varia lectio* διά τ' ἐρεύναϲε, preserved by the Σ.*ad loc.*, and the conjectures of Boeckh and Hermann, see preceding note.

25. ὁπᾶι

'By which way, along which road'. Here literally, since the 'currents in the shallows' are the path along which Heracles reached his goal.

Cf. e.g. οὐδ' ὀρθὸϲ δύναται ϲτῆναι ποϲὶν οὐδὲ νέεϲθαι Ι οἴκαδ', ὅπηι οἱ νόϲτοϲ, *Od.*18.241/2; ἐξιχνεύϲειτε Ι τὰϲ βοῦϲ ὅπηι βεβᾶϲι, S.*fr.*314(*Ichn.*).166/7; ἕπεϲθ' ὅπηι ἄν τιϲ ἡγῆται, Th.2.11.9; αὐτοῖϲ αἵ τε ἐκδρομαὶ ὅπηι προϲπίπτοιεν ἀπήντων, Th.4.127.2, etc. There is one occurrance in Pindar of ὁπᾶι used metaphorically ('in what way, how'): τὸ δὲ ϲαφανὲϲ ἰὼν πόρϲω κατέφραϲεν, Ι ὁπᾶι τὰν πολέμοιο δόϲιν Ι ἀκρόθινα διελὼν ἔθυε καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ὅπωϲ ἄρα Ι ἔϲταϲεν ἑορτάν, *O.*10.55-8.

25. πόμπιμον ... νόϲτου τέλοϲ

By sailing through the currents in the shallows Heracles reached the end of the world, where he erected the Pillars. This was his goal and, naturally, the end of his voyage and the point where he re-

---

[108] The imperfect could have imparted the same meaning, but it would have resulted in ambiguity.

turned. The τέλος is πόμπιμον, 'sending forth,' and the attributive adjunct νόστου makes clear in what respect it was 'sending forth': it send him on his voyage back home. Also for sailors in general, who reached the Pillars in later days, this point was the πόμπιμον νόστου τέλος, 'the bounds which send men home.'

This phrase turns out to be applicable to the poet himself as well. In line 26 he breaks off this 'digression' about Heracles reaching the end of the world, motivating his thematic conduct in the subsequent lines by stating that it is preferable to deal with domestic Aeginetan heroes instead of with Heracles. So, the Pillars of Heracles in effect turn the poet back to his 'home' subject. Cf. οἴκοθεν in line 31.[109]

For **πόμπιμος** 'sending forth', cf. καὶ γὰρ πνοὰς | πρὸς οἶκον ἤδη τάσδε πομπίμους ὁρῶ, E.*Hec.*1289/90 (cf. *Hel.*1073/4), 'winds that are sending forth,' i.e., 'favourable winds' (cf. ναυσιφορήτοις δ' ἀνδράσι πρῶτα χάρις | ἐς πλόον ἀρχομένοις πομπαῖον ἐλθεῖν οὖρον· ἐοικότα γὰρ | καὶ τελευτᾶι φερτέρου νόστου τυχεῖν, *P.*1.33-5); (Menoeceus:) τί δὴ τόδ' ἔρυμά μοι γενήσεται; | (Creon:) πόμπιμος ὁ δαίμων, E.*Ph.*983/4; σπουδῆι διώκων πομπίμους χνόας ποδῶν, A.*Th.*371, the joints on which the feet play are 'sending forth, conducting' the men they belong; ἀλλὰ γόων, ὦ φίλαι, κατ' οὖρον | ἐρέσσετ' ἀμφὶ κρατὶ πόμπιμον χεροῖν | πίτυλον, A.*Th.*854-6, 'on an escorting wind of wails, friends, row with both your hands a sweep of oars on your heads.'[110] For the genitive with the adjective, cf. πάρεστε τῆσδε προστροπῆς ἐμοὶ | πομποί, A.*Eum.*84/5. See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 117. For **νόστος**, 'voyage back home', cf. *O.*8.69, *P.*1.35 (*v.s.*), *P.*4.32, 196, *N.*2.24, *N.*9.23, *I.*8.51, B.13.130, etc. See further my note on *P.*8.83, p. 584.

25. κατέβαινε

Heracles 'landed' on his destination. For the verb used in the sense of 'landing,' 'arriving at one's destination,' cf., e.g., ἐς δ' Ἰαολκὸν ἐπεὶ κατέβα ναυτᾶν ἄωτος, *P.*4.188[111]; καί νυν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων σὺν Διαγόραι κατέβαν, τὰν ποντίαν | ὑμνέων ... Ῥόδον, *O.*7.13/4; τῶι μὲν διδύμας χάριτας | εἰ κατέβαν ... ἄγων, *P.*3.72/3, *sc.* to Sicily. For the verb see further my note on *P.*8.78 (pp. 654-9). For the verbal repetition in line 42 below see interpretation, pp. 210, 226.

• *Aspect:* The choice of the imperfect is to be explained in terms of the structure of the narrative. The story about Heracles is related in

---

[109] See also Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 153-162; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 133-62; Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, 49/50.

[110] Or: 'on a wind of wails, row a conducting sweep of oars on your head'. It will be clear that lament is compared to sea-faring. The words belonging to the *vehicle* are κατ' οὖρον | ἐρέσσετ' ... πόμπιμον ... | πίτυλον. Within the terminology of the *vehicle*, the wind is 'escorting' the sweep of oars, or the sweep of oars is 'conducting' the ship.

[111] Cf. Σ.*ad loc.* (334, II 134 Dr.): τὸ δὲ κατέβα ἀντὶ τοῦ κατῆλθε· καὶ πυκνῶς αὐτῶι χρῆται, τῶι καταβῆναι ἀντὶ τοῦ παραγενέσθαι.

a series of sentences all containing an aorist (ἔθηκε, 22; δάμαςε, 23; ἐρεύναςε, 24; φράδαςε, 26). Each action is presented as an independent step in the narrative. The dependent clause ὁπᾶι πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόςτου τέλος provides the background to ἰδίαι τ' ἐρεύναςε τεναγέων ῥοάς, since it defines what τεναγέων ῥοάς are meant. For clauses providing background information to the main sequel, a present tense stem form is the most obvious choice.[112]

For the indicative in a subordinate clause in a past context, instead of a so-called 'oblique' optative, cf. e.g. ὁ δέ οἱ φράζε καὶ παντὶ στρατῶι, ποίαις ὁμιλήςει τύχαις, *N.*1.61. Cf. also *P.*4.63 (with Braswell *ad loc.*). See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 271/2. Contrast μόλοι, line 63 below.

26. καὶ γᾶν φράδαςε

'And he pointed out the earth'. φράδαςε is a *hapax*. Probably it is a poetic equivalent of φράζω in the sense of 'pointing out, showing.'[113] καὶ γᾶν φράδαςε is a remarkably condensed expression. Heracles reached the end of the world and marked it out as such by setting up the Pillars; thus, in defining and pointing out the boundaries of the world, he defined and pointed out the world itself.[114] This presenting of Heracles as an explorer is quite striking. See further interpretation, pp. 227/8.

For **γᾶ** referring to the earth in its totality, cf. e.g. the name γᾶς ὀμφαλός for Delphi (*P.*8.59, *P.*11.10, *Pae.*6.120). For γᾶ including both land and sea, cf. [ο]ἱ μὲν ἱππήων στρότον οἱ δὲ πέςδων | οἱ δὲ νάων φαῖς' ἐπ[ὶ] γᾶν μέλαι[ν]αν | [ἔ]μμεναι κάλλιςτον, *S.fr.*16.1-3.

Some take γᾶν specificly to refer to the land near the straits. Fennell (*ad loc.*, p. 30): "'made the land known,' i.e., explored the shores as he had the straits". Bury (*ad loc.*, p. 50): "φραδάζω may mean 'to discover by φραδή,' that is, by conjecture or divination; he discovered the land which he had divined." Thus also Farnell *ad loc.* Apart from the fact the there is no indication whatsoever that φράδαςε could mean 'discover by divination,' this interpretation is very unlikely because it would result in καὶ γᾶν φράδαςε being a mere afterthought rather than the very climax of the narrative; moreover, that he discovered the land where he wanted to go has been sufficiently made clear by the preceeding clause.

---

[112] See P.J. Hopper, *Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse*, Syntax and Semantics Vol. 12: *Discourse and Syntax*, 1979, 213 ff.; Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 23. This instance shows that Sicking's observation that this criterion is only operative with durative verbs (p. 23) does not hold true.

[113] As in: ἤιομεν, ὄφρ' ἐς χῶρον ἀφικόμεθ', ὃν φράςε Κίρκη, *Od.*11.22; βούλευε φρεςὶν ἧιςιν ὁδόν, τὴν πέφραδ' Ἀθήνη, *Od.*1.444; οὗτος δή τοι, ξεῖνε πάτερ, δόμος, ὅν με κελεύεις | πεφραδέμεν, *Od.*7.48/9, etc.

[114] Cf. the Σ.*ad h.l.* (45a, III 49 Dr.): ἀντὶ τοῦ φραδητὴν ἐποίηςε καὶ δήλην ἕως τίνος πορευτὴ καὶ ἕως τίνος ἡ θάλαςςα πλωτή, ἐπιςτήςας τὰς ςτήλας αὐτός.

26-32

My heart, to what foreign cape do you lead astray my voyage? I tell you to bring the Muse to Aeacus and his race. The highest justice follows the precept "praise the noble." Desires for what belongs to others are not stronger (better, more preferable) for a man to bear. Search for what comes from your (own) home. Contributory adornment you have, to sing something sweet.

26-28

For an analysis of the 'break-off' see pp. 204-6, 224-8 above. For a more general discussion of the fictional dimension of break off passages and related instances of imitation of ex tempre speech see the introduction, pp. 34-7.

There is interaction and continuity between the wording of the preceding narrative and its break-off. ἀλλοδαπὰν ἄκραν also literally refers to the preceding theme, the 'digression' about Heracles, which started and ended with a reference to the Pillars of Heracles. This explains the choice of the word ἄκρα, 'cape, headland,' being especially suitable to refer to Calpe and Abyla. These capes are 'foreign' from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience. Pindar calls himself back from a digression he pretends to be irrelevant and makes a transition to the praise of local Aeginetan heroes. He does so by focussing on the setting of both stories, calling himself back from Gibraltar to Aegina.

This technique may be compared to the transition in *N.*5.14-21, especially to καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί, line 21. Pindar compares himself to eagles, having the ability to cross the sea. This can be interpreted literally as mirroring the transition from the site of the first episode of the myth on Aegina (8, 16) and Thessaly, where the second episode occurs (22). The poet flies across the sea and the scene switches from Aegina to Thessaly. See my notes, pp. 70, 132 above, and my observations in *CPh* 89, 1994, 309-11.

An ἄκρα, 'headland,' is a dangerous place for ships; so it is being suggested that the ode is heading for a place where it is likely to crash, which makes it necessary for the poet to alter his course.[115]

There is often a connotation of 'risk' or 'danger' in break off passages. Cf., e.g., κώπαν σχάσον, ταχὺ δ' ἄγκυραν ἔρεισον χθονὶ | πρῴραθε, χοιράδος ἄλκαρ πέτρας, *P.*10.51/2; Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν· ἀπότρεπε | αὖτις Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός, *N.*4.69/70; ἀπό μοι λόγον | τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον· ἐπεὶ τό γε λοιδορῆσαι θεοὺς | ἐχθρὰ σοφία, καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι

[115] "Wie in der 10. Pythie [lines 51/2] wird also auch in unserem Gedicht der Gang des Liedes mit der Fahrt eines Schiffes verglichen, das an den Felsen der Küste zu scheitern droht. Es erhellt, daß in einer so gefährlichen Situation der bisherige Kurs sofort geändert werden muß", Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 279.

παρὰ καιρὸν | μανίαιϲιν ὑποκρέκει, *O*.9.35-9, etc. Carey, *The Passionate Intellect*, pp. 97/8, draws attention to the remarkably charged language in these and similar examples relating to the role of the poet in perpetuating certain kinds of story, as well as to the fact that such a passionate *ethos* is absent from Pindar's contemporary epinician poets.

Pindar often metaphorically describes the course of his ode as the course of a ship, especially at points in the poem where the structure becomes visible, such as openings, closings, and break-off passages.[116] Cf. *P*.11.38-40, *N*.6.55-7, *N*.4.69/70, *N*.5.50/1 (see comm *ad loc.*), *P*.2.62/3, *P*.10.51-4. Cf. also phrases like οὖρον ὕμνων, *P*.4.3; οὖρον ἐπέων εὐκλέα, *N*.6.28. Cf. also *O*.6.100-5; *O*.13.49.

The calling upon the **θυμόϲ**, as an indication for a break-off, may be compared to: ἔπεχε νῦν ϲκοπῶι τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶϲ αὖτε φρενὸϲ εὐκλέαϲ ὀϊϲτοὺϲ ἱέντεϲ; *O*.2.89/90; μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον | ϲπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, *P*.3.61/2. Cf. also the invocation of the addressee, or the audience, in break-off passages: ὦ φίλοι, *P*.11.38 (not line 76 below, see my note).

•*Literature:* On speeches to ones own θυμόϲ see H. Pelliccia, *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar*, Göttingen 1995, esp. p. 344. On maritime imagery, especially in break-off passages, see Becker, *Bild des Weges*, pp. 71/2; Steiner, *Crown of Song*, 66-75. See also Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 153-162; J. Dumortier, *Les images dans la poésie d'Eschyle*, Paris 1935; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, 133-62; Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, 49/50; D. van Nes, *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos*, Diss. Utrecht, Groningen 1963, 92; J. Péron, *Les images maritimes de Pindare*, Paris 1974, 34/5, 79-81. On 'Elements of Style in Break-Offs', see Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 41-57.[117]

• *Coordination:* For asyndetic self-exhortations in break-off passages, cf. e.g. ἀπό μοι λόγον | τοῦτον, ϲτόμα, ῥῖψον, *O*.9.35/6; *P*.10.51-4, *N*.4.69/70 (contrast the self-exhortation with δέ in *O*.13.93-5). Asyndeton as such is a familiar characteristic of break-off passages. This is not surprizing in the light of the fact that making a fresh start may be one of the motifs for an author not to connect his phrase with the preceding one by means of a syntactic connection. Another explanation for the relative frequency of asyndeton in break-off passages is that asyndeton has a special affinity with shifts regarding the type of utterance. These shifts (e.g. from statement to question or adhortation; from question to adhortation and *vice*

[116] "Das Pindarische Siegeslied ist in besonderer Weise ein 'Durchlaufen' von Dingen in der Wirklichkeit. Für jedes Gedicht, das bei ihm bestellt wurde, lag ihm ein fester Kreis von Gegebenheiten der Welt des Siegers vor. ... Gegeben war ihm also eine vielstaltige Aufgabe für die preisende 'Erzählung', das 'Programm'. ... Der stete Wechsel des Gegenstandes, um den ganzen Kreis der Gegebenheiten in der Spanne des Liedes durchlaufen zu können, bringt dem Dichter die Art seines Tuns zum besonders lebendigen Bewußtsein.", Becker, *Bild des Weges*, p. 70.

[117] It may be noticed that Race's conclusion "that each of these passages ends with a forceful word or phrase denoting death or suffering that prepares for the poet's sudden intrusion into his poem" (*op.cit.*, p. 57) does not apply to *h.l.*

versa) frequently occur in break-off passages. See further Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 41-57; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 369-76. For a more general account see Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 40-4. The self-exhortation is introduced by **ἀλλ'**, serving as an additional mark for a new start, in: ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχαμα κατάβρεχε ϲιγᾷ, *I.*5.51. See further my note on *P.*8.96, p. 599.

26-27. ἀλλοδαπὰν | ἄκραν

On the level of the terminology of the *tenor* ἀλλοδαπὰν ἄκραν refers to 'foreign' theme, a story about a non-Aeginetan hero. On the level of the terminology of the *vehicles* it refers to the setting of this 'digression' about Heracles, which started and ended with a reference to the Pillars of Heracles. On the level of the *vehicle* ἄκρα, 'cape, headland,' refers to Calpe or Abyla.[118] ἄκρα evokes the association of the song/ship being on a dangerous course, heading for a place where it is likely to crash, which makes it necessary for the poet to alter his course (see above). On the level of both the *tenor* and the *vehicle* the ἄκρα is 'foreign' from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience.

ἄκρα, 'cape, headland, promontory' does probably not occur elsewhere in Pindar. In ἔκ τε Πύλου καὶ ἀπ' ἄκρας Ταινάρου, *P.*4.174, ἄκρας is generally taken to be an adjective,[119] although the possibility of it being a noun is by no means excluded. The noun is not uncommon in epic, cf., e.g., τῶι ῥα προκρόϲϲαϲ ἔρυϲαν, καὶ πλῆϲαν ἀπάϲηϲ | ἠϊόνοϲ ϲτόμα μακρόν, ὅϲον ϲυνεέργαθον ἄκραι, *Il.*14.35/6. The sea is usually quite wild near capes: ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκραι | ἠϊόνεϲ βοάουϲιν ἐρευγομένηϲ ἁλὸϲ ἔξω, *Il.*17.264/5; ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκραϲ | κυρτὸν ἰὸν κορυφοῦται (*sc.* κῦμα θαλάϲϲηϲ), *Il.*4.425/6. Capes are therefore dangerous for ships: νῆ' ἀμὴν κατέαξε Ποϲειδάων ἐνοϲίχθων | πρὸϲ πέτρηιϲι βαλὼν ὑμῆϲ ἐπὶ πείραϲι γαίηϲ, | ἄκρηι προϲπελάϲαϲ, *Od.*9.283-5. For **ἀλλοδαπόϲ**, 'foreign,' cf. *P.*4.50, *P.*4.254, *N.*1.22. Cf. also *Il.*16.550, *Od.*17.485, A.*Th.*1082, etc.

27. ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβηιϲ

The mss. read παραμείβηι (or παραμείβη, which is impossible). This reading has been suspected because there is no positive evidence for Pindar using the deliberative subjunctive.[120] This has led Boeckh to

---

[118] Maas' conjecture ἀκτάν (in the apparatus of Schroeder's edition of 1930, accepted by Becker, *Bild des Weges*, p. 72) is therefore unnecessary. It would even weaken the passage, in that it would disturb the continuity of the mythological reference and the break-off imagery.

[119] As in καὶ ϲκοπιαῖϲιν [ἄκρ]αιϲ ὀρέων ὕπερ ἔϲτα, *fr.*51a.3 (suppl. Meineke). Thus, e.g., Slater in his *Lexicon*, *s.v.* (p. 26); Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 279.

[120] Τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήϲομεν; *O.*2.2, interpreted as a 'short vowel sunjunctive' by Gerber, *HSPh* 91, 1987, 87/8, is probably a future (see Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 266). On the other hand, a sure example of a present tense indicative in a question is: ἔπεχε νῦν ϲκοπῶι τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν; *O.*2.89.

read παρεμείβεαι, which is almost generally accepted by the modern editors. Maas preferred the active form παραμείβεις (adopted by Bowra).

Two objections are to be raised against Boeckh's generally accepted conjecture. First, there is no need to condemn the mss. reading merely because it would be the only certain occurance of the deliberative subjunctive in Pindar. Such a subjunctive does occur in Homer,[121] so Pindar may use it, if only once. Second, notwithstanding its general acceptance, παραμείβεαι is very difficult to explain. It is clear that the phrase as a whole must mean something like 'you divert my course.' But παραμείβομαι means 'pass by, leave on one side.'

Cf. e.g. παρημείβοντο Μάλειαν, *h.Ap.*409; πύλας παραμείψεται, Thgn.709, i.e. 'pass through' them; θεός, ὃ καὶ πτερόεντ' αἰετὸν κίχε, καὶ θαλασσαῖον παραμείβεται | δελφῖνα, *P.*2.50/1, i.e. 'overtake, outstrip in speed'; cf. also E.*IA* 146, etc.

For *h.l.*, the semantic inconvenience is usually disposed of by taking the verb as 'causal,' in the sense of 'turning aside, diverting.'[122] There is, however, no parallel to this usage. So the problem with the mss. reading is not the subjunctive, but rather the semantics of medio-passive παραμείβομαι.

For an active form of the verb in the sense required here some support can be found. In the *Suda Lexicon* the active παραμείψας is paraphrased as παραλλάξας (π 398.1). The verb παραλλάσσω may be used in the sense required here,[123] but, unfortunately, it can equally well be a paraphrase of the familiar usage of active παραμείβω in the sense of the medio-passive 'passing by, leaving on one side.'[124] However, further support for the use of active παραμείβω in the sense of 'diverting' can be found in a glosse by Hesychius: παραμεῦσαι· παραλλάξαι, ἐκτραπῆναι. As ἐκτραπῆναι cannot be an alternative paraphrase of 'passing by, leaving on one side,' the double rendering by Hesychius is probably to be taken to paraphrase transitive and intransitive usages of active παραμεῦσαι in the sense of 'diverting' and 'being diverted' respectively. If it is assumed that παραμείβω and παραμεύβω are dialectical variants, with no lexical difference,[125] and if it is accepted that

---

[121] Cf. e.g. πῆι γὰρ ἐγώ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω; τεῦ δώμαθ' ἵκωμαι; *Od.*15.509, etc.

[122] Thus LSJ *s.v.*; Bury, *ad loc.* (p. 50); Slater *s.v.* simply creates a special category 'lead astray' for this single instance.

[123] Cf. e.g. Hdt.2.49, Aeschin.3.192, S.*Ant.*298.

[124] As, e.g., in: 'Ρῆνος καὶ ῎Ιστρος οἱ ποταμοὶ ὑπ' ἄρκτον ῥέουσιν, ὁ μὲν Γερμανοὺς ὁ δὲ Παίονας παραμείβων, Arist.*Mir.*846b29/30. Cf. ὅταν τὸ ὕδωρ παραλλάξηι το χωρίον, D.55.17.

[125] Παραμεύβομαι is used in the same sense as παραμείβομαι, though metaphorically, in: εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφᾶι παραμεύσεται ἄλλους, *N.*11.13, 'pass by', i.e. 'overtake', i.e. 'surpass'.

Hesychius was familiar with uses of the latter in the sense παραλλάξαι, ἐκτραπῆναι now lost to us, we might deduct that the former may also be used in this sense ('to divert' and 'to be diverted' resp.). If this hypothesis is accepted, the *Suda Lexicon* has in fact chosen a quite adequate paraphrase, in that παραλλάξας covers both the familiar usage of παραμείβω in the sense of 'passing by' and its usage in the sense of 'diverting,' of which we would here have the sole surviving example.

If we choose to read an active form here, we can choose either Maas' παραμείβεις or παραμείβηις. Both conjectures involve nothing more than supplying the final *sigma*; Pindar himself could not make the difference between both in writing. The deliberative subjunctive is quite rare in the second person. Its usage seems to be confined to cases like (Epops:) τί σοι πιθώμεσθ'; (Pisthethaerus:) ὅ τι πίθησθε; Ar.*Av.*164, repeating the question. Goodwin (*Moods and Tenses*, p. 100) gives πῶς οὖν ἔτ' εἴπηις ὅτι συνέσταλμαι κακοῖς; E.*HF* 1417, as the only example of the second person, but suspects the text precisely because it would be the only example. However, the mss. are unanimous. Moreover, the second person here is less problematic than in E.*HF* 1417: the poet is addressing his own θυμός, a situation in which the second person is as good as identical with the first. Moreover, the force of a deliberative subjunctive would suit the fiction of the poet facing danger (see my note on ἄκραν above) and in an agony of doubt asking himself why he has lead astray his own poem. In contrast, an indicative would result in a flat, factual question. I prefer to read παραμείβηις.

28. Αἰακῶι σε φαμὶ γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν

'I tell you to bring the Muse to Aeacus and his race'. After having broken off the 'digression' about Heracles (22-6) in the preceding sentence, the poet here defines the new and 'right' subject matter, inborn Aeginetan heroes. He does so by telling his θυμός to 'bring the Muse' to them. The Muse is, in fact, his 'cargo.'[126]

Cf. φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας | ἄστει γλῶσσαν, *O.*9.41/2, introducing the story about Deucalion and Pyrrha (for φέρειν construed with a dative, cf. also *O.*9.59, 13.66, 14.21, *P.*3.45, 4.216, 278, 9.61, 10.48, etc.). For the Muse being object of similar expressions, cf. (Ἀπόλλων) πόρεν τε κίθαριν, δίδωσί Μοῖσαν οἷς ἂν ἐθέληι, *P.*5.65; γινώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ Μοῖσαν παρέχων ἅλις, *Pae.*4.23/4; οὐ γὰρ ἐν μέσοισι κεῖται | δῶρα δυσμάχητα Μοισᾶν | τὠπιτυχόντι φέρειν, B.*fr.dub.*55; εὔφημον δ' ἐπὶ βωμοῖς | Μοῦσαν θείατ' ἀοιδοί, A.*Supp.*694/5.

[126] Thus Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 155. The verb φέρειν may qualify as 'colourless' (see introduction, p. 31) to the extent that it refers to associating the Muse with the Aeacids while leaving the technicalities of this procedure to the imagination of the audience.

φαμί is a bit of a nuisance. Every interpretator agrees on it being used here in the sense of 'telling to do, commanding,' but no one is able to adduce a parallel to this usage. Unfortunately, ἔφην in Lys.16.13 (quoted by LSJ for this usage) is a (not unintelligent) conjecture of the scribe of ms. C[127]; the mediaeval archetype X reads ἔτι. The other alleged occurrence in this sense, ἔφαcαν in X.*Cyr*.4.6.11, is a *varia lectio* for ἔφραcαν. A convincing parallel would be: καὶ τὴν πόλιν cυνέχειν φηcὶν ἐν τῆι μαντείαι, ὅπωc ἂν μίαν γνώμην ἔχωcιν ἅπαντεc καὶ μὴ τοῖc ἐχθροῖc ἡδονὴν ποιῶcι, D.19.298; however, Blass has plausibly identified φηcὶν ἐν τῆι μαντείαι as a marginal glosse.[128] The usage of φαμί with a depending accusitive with infinitive construction in Pindar ranges from undisputable assertions that equal observations of facts (as in φάτο δ' Εὐρύπυλοc ... | ἔμμεναι, *P*.4.33/4), to assertions that the speaker presents as being undisputable as far as he is concerned (as in νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράcοc | δεινῶν πολέμων· ὅθεν φαμὶ καὶ cὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, *P*.2.63/4), to assertions about future events (as in φαμὶ ... Ἐπάφοιο κόραν | ἀcτέων ῥίζαν φυτεύcεcθαι, *P*.4.14/5, Medea's prophecy), to assertions about an intention on the part of the speaker being sensible in his perception (as in τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ cαφέcτατον ἔμμεν | τάνδ' ἐπιcτείχοντα νᾶcον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαιc, *I*.6.20/1). The peculiarity of the usage of φαμί here is that the depending accusitive with infinitive construction is most naturally interpreted as formulating an action that the speaker regards as desirable, that he wishes the addressee to take. Perhaps the conclusion must be that this at first sight natural interpretation is incompatible with the semantics of φαμί, and that this line means: 'I assert that you bring the Muse to Aeacus and his stock,' signalling the transition that is to occur rather than commanding it. On the other hand, analogous constructions with other verbs of saying are to be found in Pindar and elsewhere: cf. the use of ἐνέπω in the sense of 'telling, bidding,' someone to do something in line 75 below, *P*.9.96, S.*OT* 350, *OC* 932 (all cited in my note on line 75, p. 392 below); cf. also the use of εἰπεῖν in this sense in: εἶπον δὲ μεμνᾶcθαι Cυρακοccᾶν τε καὶ Ὀρτυγίαc, *O*.6.92; εἶπε δ' ἐν μέccοιc ἀπάγεcθαι, ὃc ἂν πρῶτοc θορὼν | ἀμφί οἱ ψαύcειε πέπλοιc, *P*.9.119/20.

Aeacus is the archfather of the Aeginetans, who proudly claimed descend from him. In every surviving ode for an Aeginetan victor Aeacus or the Aeacids are mentioned (for references, see my note on

---

[127] Prof. Carey informed me that ms. C is reputed for scribal conjectures.

[128] φηcὶν ἐν τῆι μαντείαι SQ : secl. Blass (ἐν τῆι μαντείαι secl. Sauppe) : φηcὶν ἡ μαντεία L vulg.

*N.*5.8, p. 109). In every single Aeginetan ode but one (*P.*8) the main myth deals with the Aeacids. Cf. *I.*6.19-27.

29. ἕπεται δὲ λόγωι δίκας ἄωτος ἐςλὸν αἰνεῖν
It is argued in the appendix (pp. 630-8) that: (1) ἐςλὸν should be read. (2) This sentence means: 'Ideal justice follows the precept: praise the noble.' ἐςλὸν αἰνεῖν is the content of the λόγος. (3) Within the context of the *Abbruchsformel*, lines 29/30 together contain a motivation for the break-off, while their mutual relation is antithetical. The train of thought is to be summerized as follows: 'Why do you praise Heracles, who has nothing to do with Aegina? I tell you to praise Aeacus and his race. To praise noble men, such as Heracles and the Aeacids, is always a very just thing to do, but one should not long for what belongs to others. Look for something of your own to praise.' (4) Lifted out of their immediate context, lines 29/30 formulate a fundamental aspect of aristocratic ethics. (5) This extratextual interpretation of lines 29/30 explains (a) that neither the fact that both sentences are a motivation of what has preceded, nor the antithesis between both sentences is being explicitly marked as such (we only have δέ twice, which leaves the interpretation of the role both sentences play in the light of what has preceded and the relation between both sentences entirely to the hearer), and (b) the surpisingly emphatic, superlative presentation of δίκα by means of ἄωτος.

Antistrophe B

30. οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέςςονες
'Desires for what belongs to others are not stronger (i.e. better, more preferable) for a man to bear (to live with)'. This *gnome* serves as a justification of the break-off of the story about Heracles, who is not an Aeginetan hero and therefore ἀλλότριος.

• *Coordination:* On the first level of interpretation (see above), the thought expressed in 30/1 forms an antithesis to the one expressed in line 29. 'To praise noble men, such as Heracles and the Aeacids, is always a very just thing to do, *but (although this is the case, there is one objection against praising Heracles:)* one should not long for what belongs to others. Look for something of your own to praise.' This antithesis is left implicit. The only signal for the connection between this sentence and the preceding one is **οὐδ'**, which only indicates that a negated sentence follows, expressing a new step in the argument, without making explicit the nature of the logical relation of this sen-

tence with the preceding one. The interpretation of it is left to the audience.[129]

This use of οὐδέ can be compared to passages like ἐπὶ δὲ βοcτρύχοιc | πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν, E.*Ba*.757/8, where the clause introduced by οὐδέ denies a natural implication of the preceding clause. Cf. further: ὦ γενέθλα γενναίων, | ἥκετ' ἐμῶν καμάτων παραμύθιον· | οἶδά τε καὶ ξυνίημι τάδ', οὔ τί με | φυγγάνει, οὐδ' ἐθέλω προλιπεῖν τόδε, S.*El*.129-32. Another case in point may be A.*Ag*.1498. See further Denniston, *Particles*, p. 191. For Pindar, Slater gives three examples: ἔνθα τραφεῖc' ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνι γλυκείαc πρῶτον ἔψαυc' Ἀφροδίταc. | οὐδ' ἔλαθ' Αἴπυτον ἐν παντὶ χρόνωι κλέπτοιcα θεοῖο γόνον, *O*.6.35/6; ἐλθόντοc γὰρ εὐνάcθη ξένου | λέκτροιcιν ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίαc. | οὐδ' ἔλαθε cκοπόν, *P*.3.25-7; καὶ θεῶν δαῖταc προcέπτυκτο πάcαc· οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν | οὖροc ἐμπνεύcαιc ὑπέcτειλ' ἱcτίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν, *I*.2.39/40. The last one seems to be entirely progressive to me. As for *O*.6 and *P*.3, it is true that one's natural inclination would be to render 'but not' in both cases; however, also in these cases a progressive interpretation 'and not' is very well possible.

Although the use of οὐδέ leaving implicit an antithetical relation can be parallelled, it seems a fair question to ask why Pindar has chosen to leave the logical relation implicit here. Apart from that there is a natural tendency in poetry, and especially in Pindar, not to express logical relations explicitly (see introduction, pp. 26-30), in this particular case, the implictness in this respect sustains the poly-interpretability of these lines. See appendix, pp. 630-8. If they are interpreted 'The ultimate essence of the way it should be [in society] follows the precept: praise an ἐcλόc; and desires for what belongs to others are not stronger for a man to bear [i.e., and do not strive at taking away from the ἐcλοί what is theirs]', there is no antithesis between lines 29 and 30. If Pindar had provided a signal explicitly indicating that line 30 is antithetical to 29, he would have taken away the ambiguity by excluding the possibility of interpreting lines 29/30 together as referring also to social conditions instead of merely to poetical procedures. The same motif underlies the choice of δέ (instead of, e.g., γάρ) in line 29. By explicitly marking lines 29/30 as a motivation for the transition between two themes, their applicability would have been limited to the immediate context in which they occur.

The meaning and relevance of **φέρειν** are obscure. The infinitive must depend on the adjective, defining the area for which the statement οὐδ' ... κρέccονεc is valid. But in the light of this defining function, the choice of the 'colourless' φέρειν (see introduction, p. 31) is

---

[129] One can imagine a prose writer to use ἀλλ' οὐκ ... or οὐ μέντοι in cases like this.

odd. Two connotations could be relevant. The verb can be taken as 'bring', i.e. 'show, display'[130] ('Desires for what belongs to others are not the best thing to display'), or as 'carry', i.e. 'have with one'[131] ('Desires for what belongs to others are not a good companion for a man'). The construction ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέccονες bears close resemblance to the phrase καὶ τὸ cιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐcτὶ cοφώτατον ἀνθρώπωι νοῆcαι, *N.*5.18. Both phrases are gnomic justifications of break-offs. In *N.*5.18 we have a superlative, here a comparative. In both sentences a dative reference to a 'man' or 'human' in general occurs. And both phrases have an infinitive, depending on the adjective, which does not seem to add much to the meaning of the sentence as a whole. In both cases the statement would have been complete and clear enough without the infinitive (see further my note *ad loc.*, pp. 125/6).

Pindar not seldom uses **κρέccων**, 'stronger,' metaphorically, qualifying inanimate notions.

Cf. πένθος δὲ πίτνει βαρὺ | κρεccόνων πρὸc ἀγαθῶν, *O.*2.23/4, 'deep sorrow falls (goes away) by the force of stronger, mightier good fortune,' κρεccόνων implying that the ἀγαθά triumph over the πένθοc. In φέρτερον πατέροc | ἄνακτα γόνον τεκεῖν | ποντίαν θεόν, ὃc κεραυνοῦ τε κρέccον ἄλλο βέλοc | διώξει χερὶ τριόδοντόc τ' ἀμαιμακέτου, *I.*8.32-5, the βέλοc symbolizes the power of Thetis' son; the son was prophesied to be stronger than the father, which is visualized by stating that he will have a stronger, more powerful weapon than Zeus' thunderbold or Poseidon's trident.

When used as a qualification of abstractions κρέccων refers to the fact that the notion qualified is 'superior, greater, better,' than something else.

Cf. ἀcτῶν δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει μάλιcτ' ἐcλοῖcιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοιc. | ἀλλ' ὅμωc, κρέccων γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνοc, | μὴ παρίει καλά, *P.*1.84-6, success frequently produces envy, but still, since being envied is better than being pitied, this is no reason to stop seeking success; κρέccων here denotes that φθόνοc is 'superior,' i.e., 'preferable' to οἰκτιρμόc (a nuance most relevant to *h.l.*). Cf. ἔχων | κρέccονα πλούτου μέριμναν, *P.*8.91/2, with my note p. 592. Cf. also ἐντί τοι φίλιπποί τ' αὀτόθι καὶ κτεάνων ψυχὰc ἔχοντεc κρέccοναc | ἄνδρεc, *N.*9.32/3; κρέccονα μὲν ἁλικίαc | νόον φέρβεται | γλῶccάν τε, *P.*5.109-11 (although one could also argue that the men's souls are 'superior' to possessions in the sense that they have mastery over them instead of being mastered themselves, i.e., 'stronger,' as in the previous set of examples). Cf. also ἀλλ' εἰ δίκαια, τῶν cοφῶν κρείccω τάδε, S.*Ph.*1246, 'but if just, that is better than wise' (transl. Jebb).

[130] Cf., e.g., ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον 'Αντίλοχοc βιατὰc νόημα τοῦτο φέρων, *P.*6.29; χρὴ δ' ἄνδρα τοκεῦcιν φέρειν βαθύδοξον αἶcαν, *Pae.*2.57.

[131] Cf., e.g., ὁ πονήcαιc δὲ νόωι καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει, *I.*1.40; cοφοὶ δέ τοι κάλλιον | φέροντι καὶ τὰν θεόcδοτον δύναμιν, *P.*5.12/3.

Here the choice for the comparative is motivated by the implicit comparison with the alternative for the ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες, which is explicitly given in the following line (οἴκοθεν μάτευε).

For **ἀνήρ** referring to any man in general, cf. *O.*1.35, *O.*7.25/6, etc. Plural: *O.*2.33/4, *O.*12.5/6, etc. Cf. also ἀνθρώπωι in *N.*5.18 cited above. For **ἔρωτες**, cf. καὶ γὰρ | ἑτέροις ἑτέρων ἔρωτες ἔκνιξαν[132] φρένας, *P.*10.59/60; ἀπροσίκτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀξύτεραι μανίαι, *N.*11.48. Cf. also A.*Pers.*824-6; E.*fr.*1076.2/3, 1077 (*v.s.*). For **ἀλλότριος** cf. *P.*1.84, 11.27, *N.*1.54, *I.*1.15.

31. οἴκοθεν μάτευε

'Search for what comes from your (own) home'. This is the preferable alternative to the ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες of the preceding line. οἴκοθεν, 'what comes from one's οἶκος', in the general formulation of the *gnome* refers to everything that is near, one's own and ready at hand.[133] When applied to the break-off context in which it occurs, it refers to inborn Aeginetan heroes, as opposed to Heracles, the Theban hero.

These two words can be considered characteristic of Pindar's style for five reasons. In the first place the relation of this phrase with the preceding one is, once again, left implicit. It is clear that οἴκοθεν μάτευε is the preferable alternative to the ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες of line 30, and that it therefore forms an antithesis to the preceding sentence. However, any signal guiding the audience to this interpretation is absent. By means of asyndeton this phrase is just juxtaposed to the preceding one. Second, the phrase is paradoxical to a certain degree, due to the choice of the verb ματεύω. 'Seeking' implies a quest for something or someone absent, while οἴκοθεν refers to everything that is near, present and ready to hand. Third, the phrase is out of the ordinary syntactically, since οἴκοθεν, being adverbial or adnominal by virtue of the suffix, here appears where we would expect a direct object. Fourth, οἴκοθεν is a specific and graphic word, here serving as a symbol for anything that is one's own[134], in opposition to ἀλλοτρίων. Fifth, οἴκοθεν is ironical coming from Pindar's mouth. See p. 206 above. On irony in break-off passages see also introduction, pp. 36/7.

---

[132] A.W. Mair: ἔρως ἔκνιξε codd. *contra metrum*.

[133] Young, *Three Odes*, Appendix I, pp. 116-20, collected and schematized almost fifty instances in Greek literature of what he calls 'the theme of the near and the far'. For Pindar cf. esp. *P.*3.20-3, 61/2, 108-11, *I.*7.40-4, *I.*8.13/4, *N.*11.48.

[134] Pindar's penchant for specific and graphic words applies mainly to nouns. As far as verbs are concerned, he often follows exactly the opposite strategem, using unspecific and 'empty' verbs. See introduction, pp. 31/2. Cf. also my note on *N.*5.2 ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι, p. 102.

For the 'ablative' suffix **-θεν**, see above my note on cέθεν, line 5 (pp. 250/1) See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 134 (§ 144). For **οἴκοθεν**, cf. οὐ ψεῦδιc ὁ μάρτυc ἔργμαcιν ἐπιcτατεῖ. I Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διόc τ' ἐκγόνων θραcύ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν I φαενναῖc ἀρεταῖc ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων I οἴκοθεν, *N.*7.49-52; Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, pp. 54/5 (312/3) interprets "Aigina, dem Ruhm *deiner* Heroen schreibst du selbst den gültigen Weg vor" (p. 55 [313]). Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 157, paraphrases similarly: "Here he says that one need not look far for tales when praising the Aeacidae; there is a plentiful supply near at hand"[135]. The emphatic τεῶν (50), κυρίαν (51), and οἴκοθεν (52)[136] seem to justify this interpretation. Cf. further Ἁγηcία δέξαιτο κῶμον I οἴκοθεν οἴκαδ' ἀπὸ Cτυμφαλίων τειχέων ποτινιcόμενον, *O.*6.98/9, cf. *O.*7.4; τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν I ἀντία πράξει, *P.*8.51/2, with my note, pp. 537/8. Cf. also *O.*3.44, *I.*4.12, *N.*7.52, *N.*9.19, *Pae.*4.32. For **ματεύω**, cf. *O.*5.24, *I.*5.14, *fr.*106.5/6. Cf. also μαcτεύω,[137] *P.*3.59/60; *P.*4.35, *N.*8.43.

31-32. ποτίφορον δὲ κόcμον ἔλαχεc I γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν

'You have adornment at your disposal that is contributory to the singing of something sweet.' κόcμοc refers to the mythical arsenal, the mythical stock about the Aeacids. The poet need not seek abroad for themes that contribute to Aristoclidas' celebration, there is plenty material available at home, i.e., in Aegina, which is 'contibuting' to the aims of the ode in accordance with the principles formulated in the preceding lines.[138] Thus the story about Heracles is in retrospect, implicitly, characterized as not ποτίφοροc, not contributing to the aims of the present ode, and therefore unfit to relate (cf. *O.*9.80-4, cited below). For the idea cf. *N.*6.27-34, *I.*4.1-3, *O.*6.12, *P.*6.7, *h.Ap.*20/1, B.5.31ff., etc.

The adjective πρόcφοροc (**ποτίφοροc**) is usually rendered as 'suitable, fitting.' The link with προcφέρω is, however, closer than these renderings suggest. Something that is πρόcφοροc is 'contributing',—what it contibutes to either being expressed by a complement (usually a dative), or left implicit. So the claim made by πρόcφοροc is much stronger than that it is 'suitable': it denotes 'positively beneficial.' In other words, the oppo-

---

135 See also Fraccaroli *ad loc.*; Gildersleeve, *AJPh* 31, 1910, p. 137.

136 Carey's first suggestion for interpreting οἴκοθεν, as referring to innate excellence (p. 157), qualifying λόγων, is very attractive. For other possibilities, see Carey, pp. 156/7.

137 Very plausibly considered to be merely a metrical alternative by Braswell on *P.*4.35(c) and pp. 402/3.

138 Cf. also Σ.*ad h.l.* (54a, III 50 Dr.): πρόcφορον, οἰκεῖον ἔπαινον ἔλαχεc καὶ ἔχειc, ὅπερ δὴ γλυκύτατόν ἐcτι λέγειν, τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων καλῶν ἐγκωμιάζεcθαι. Alternatively, one might feel tempted to take κόcμοc to refer to the poet's task which has fallen to his lot (cf. 12/3); γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν could then be taken to define κόcμοc as such. However, this interpretation does not square with the context. The point is that the poet acknowledges the righness of Aeginetan legend, which is—apart from being in itself complimentary to his audience—an additional argument not to look abroad for stories.

site of πρόσφορος is 'damaging,' rather than just 'unfit.' Examples of the complement to the adjective being explicitly mentioned include: τὰ πρόσφορα τῆι στρατιῆι, Hdt.7.20; δράσω καὶ τάδε, καὶ πάνθ' ὁπόσ' ἂν | μέλλω πράσσειν πρόσφορά θ' ὑμῖν | καὶ τῶι κατὰ γῆς, ὃς νέον ἔρρει, πρὸς χάριν, οὐ δεῖ μ' ἀποκάμνειν, S.*OC* 1773-6, 'contibuting', i.e., 'for your advantage and to the gratification of the dead' (Jebb *ad loc.*). In ⟨Φοῖνιξ⟩ ὃς Δολόπων ἄγαγε θρασὺν ὅμιλον σφενδονᾶσαι | ἱπποδάμων Δαναῶν βέλεσι πρόσφορον, *fr.*183, the Dolopes use their slings in such a way that they make a useful contribution to the projectiles of the Greeks. In σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον, | ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων | κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω· ποτίφορος δ' ἀγαθοῖσι μισθὸς οὗτος, *N.*7.61-3, singing true praise is the reward 'contibuting to' the ἀγαθοί; thus the reward is not merely 'suitable' (with the suggestion that it is the reward the ἀγαθοί are entitled to[139]), but also 'servicable' to the ἀγαθοί, with the suggestion that true praise contibutes to the ἀγαθοί being recognized as such (as opposed to false praise, which will only damage their reputation). Often the complement is left implicit: ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλὸν | μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾶι καλύψαι· θεσπεσία δ' ἐπέων καύχας[140] ἀοιδὰ πρόσφορος, *N.*9.6-8, where 'divine song of vaunting words' is 'contributing,' *viz.* to a noble thing done not being hided on the ground in silence. Cf. also *fr.*94b.37. In *O.*9 Pindar breaks off a myth with the wish: εἴην εὑρεσιεπὴς ἀναγεῖσθαι | πρόσφορος ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρωι· ...| ... προξενίαι δ' ἀρετᾶι τ' ἦλθον | τιμάορος Ἰσθμίαισι Λαμπρομάχου μίτραις, *O.*9.80-4; Pindar whishes that he may continue while 'contributing' to the aims of the victory-ode. Taking πρόσφορος to mean 'contributing,' rather than just 'apt,' helps to explain the following, difficult, passage: ὦ Μέγα, τὸ δ' αὖτις τεὰν ψυχὰν κομίξαι | οὔ μοι δυνατόν· κενεᾶν δ' ἐλπίδων χαῦνον τέλος· | σεῦ δὲ πάτραι Χαριάδαις τε λάβρον | ὑπερεῖσαι λίθον Μοισαῖον ἕκατι ποδῶν εὐωνύμων | δὶς δὴ δυοῖν. χαίρω δὲ πρόσφορον | ἐν μὲν ἔργωι κόμπον ἱείς, ἐπαοιδαῖς δ' ἀνὴρ | νώδυνον καί τις κάματον θῆκεν· ἦν γε μὰν ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος | δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰν Ἀδράστου τάν τε Καδμείων ἔριν, *N.*8.44-51; this must mean: I cannot possibly restore your father to life, but I can rear a monument to father and son. I am glad to utter praise contributing (to you and your father) regarding your accomplishments, and I hope that it may also alleviate your pain. The present victory-ode is not just 'apt,' or 'suitable,' for the victories won by Deinias and his father Megas: the point is that the song of praise is 'contributing,' i.e., 'helpful.' That it is contributing to celebrating the victories is beyond doubt, and the implicit hope is that it is just as contributing to alleviate the pain of Megas' death. μέν ... δ' in line 49 balance the two contributions that the ode hopefully makes.

For an infinitive as a complement to an adjective, cf. e.g. also θρέψαι ... | δύνατος, *N.*2.13/4; ἄξιος εὐλογίαις ἀνδρῶν μεμίχθαι, *I.*3.3, etc. Cf. also

---

[139] Cf. Carey *ad loc.* (*Five Odes*, p. 159): "The χρέος-motif. ... Thearion is one who has earned the prize he is given."

[140] codd. : καύχαις Benedictus.

line 30 above and *N.*5.18. For more examples, see Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 278/9 (§ 348). **κόcμοc** is 'adornment.' In ἐνέποι κεν Καλλιμάχωι λιπαρὸν | κόcμον Ὀλυμπίαι, *O.*8.82/3, it refers to the victory. In ἀμφὶ κόμαιcι βάλῃι γλαυκόχροα κόcμον ἐλαίαc, *O.*3.13, it refers to the victor's crown. It may be used as referring to a victory-ode, since an ode, like a crown, 'adorns' the victor. Cf. παῖ, τεᾶc, Ἀγηcίδαμε, παγμαχίαc ἕνεκεν | κόcμον ἐπὶ cτεφάνωι χρυcέαc ἀλαίαc | ἀδυμελῆ κελαδήcω, *O.*11.12-4, 'I shall sing adornment in addition to your crown.' In εἴπερ καθ' ὁδόν νιν (*sc.* Τιμόδημον) εὐθυπομπὸc | αἰὼν ταῖc μεγάλαιc δέδωκε Ἀθάναιc, *N.*2.7/8, the victor himself is said to be an 'adornment' for his home town. For **γλυκύc** see my note on *N.*5.2 γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά, p. 103.

• *Text:* ἔλαχεc is Bergk's generally accepted correction of the MSS.-reading ἔλαβεc. That ἔλαχεc can be regarded as an ancient variant appears from the scholiasts on this line. Σ.54a (III 50 Dr.) paraphrases: πρόcφορον, οἰκεῖον ἔπαινον ἔλαχεc καὶ ἔχειc. Σ.54b (*ibid.*) reads τοῦτο, φηcίν, ἔλαχεc (V: ἔλαβεc BD) ἐκ θεῶν, κοcμεῖν τοὺc ἀξίουc. Of both variants ἔλαχεc clearly gives the best sense. The point is that he has had the material at his disposal all the time.

32-36

Lord Peleus rejoices in ancient prowess, having cut a matchless spear, who both took Iolcus, single-handed, without an army, and caught the sea-goddess Thetis with great effort.

32-33 παλαιαῖcι δ' ἐν ἀρεταῖc | γέγαθε Πηλεὺc ἄναξ

'Lord Peleus rejoices in ancient prowess.' Peleus' ἀρεταί are παλαιαί from the perspective of the moment of the performance of the ode. Thus—as the expectation is raised that the following lines will elaborate upon these ἀρεταί,—the qualification παλαιαῖcι serves as a signal indicating that the poem will move from the present to the past. To this extent it is comparable to πρότεροι in line 13 (see p. 270) and to the frequent occurences of ποτε accompanying a relative pronoun (see my note on *N.*5.9, p. 113). For ἀρεταί, see my note on *N.*5.52/3, pp. 188-90.

The perfect **γέγαθε** refers to a present condition.[141] This present reference comes rather naturally; explaining it, however, is something else. If we are not content with the explanation that Peleus is still sitting somewhere, reviewing his ancient deeds with great satisfaction, the present reference is to explained on the basis of the cognitive process and the pragmatic considerations of the poet who pretends to produce his text spontaneously (see introduction, pp. 34-7). After the break-off of the Heracles story and its motivation, the poet

---

[141] *Pace* Sicking & Stork, *Semantics of the Verb*, p. 141 n. 38.

is to find a new, Aeginetan, personage to deal with. This time it has to be a really good subject, for the poet cannot afford to miss the mark again. So, at this point in the performance of the ode, the poet and his audience are especially concerned with the quality of the new subject. According to this (fictional) presentation it can be understood that the poet explicitly introduces his new subject as a good one. He has, so to speak, to regain the audience's goodwill. Peleus has his ancient accomplishments pleading in favour of taking him as a subject. Thus, the present reference of γέγαθε is an indication that the sentence as a whole has relevance to the present concerns that both speaker and hearer would have in the situation that is imitated here. In other words, the present reference of γέγαθε is in keeping with the imitation of spontaneous text production, in that it mirrors the cognitive and pragmatic considerations of a speaker who has just called back himself from a subject he had been dwelling on and who is now to regain the hearer's confidence for a new subject. The speaker adopts a form of the verb that has present reference, because the sentence as a whole has present relevance. According to this analysis, if not only because Peleus' personal joy is hardly relevant in this context, γέγαθε is a poetic equivalent for 'enjoys', connecting Peleus with admirable qualities rather than emphasizing his personal happiness about them (as in 'he enjoys good health').

The verb γαθέω, 'rejoice, be delighted', is used by Pindar only *h.l.* and in *P.*4.122. The verb (in the form γηθέω) is, however, frequent in epic and in tragedy. It is used almost exclusively in perfect, when referring to a present state of mind,[142] and in aorist or imperfect, when referring to a past state of mind. See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 236 (§ 290).

The (quasi pleonastic) construction found here, with **ἐν**, is somewhat unusual.[143] The closest parallel to the construction is: ἀγλαΐζεται (*sc.* Ἱέρων) δὲ καὶ | μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀώτωι, *O.*1.14/5, where Gerber (*ad loc.*, p. 37) adopts the explanation Wilamowitz (on E.*HF* 932) and Dodds (on E.*Bacch.*159) give for cases like μέλπετε τὸν Διόνυσον ... ἐν Φρυγίαισι βοαῖς ἐνοπαῖσί τε, E.*Bacch.*155-9; ἐν λόγοις | πείσειν, S.*Ph.*1393/4; κεῖνος ἐπέγνω μανίαις | ψαύων τὸν θεὸν ἐν κερτομίοις γλώσσαις, *Ant.*960/1; τοιαῦτ' ἐπεύχου μὴ φιλοστόνως θεοῖς, | μηδ' ἐν ματαίοις κἀγρίοις ποιφύγμασιν, A.*Sept.*279/80, that "in such phrases ἐν seems to mark the sphere in which an activity takes place; but we may see in them a starting-point of the development towards the Hellenistic use with an instrumental dative" (Dodds, *loc. cit.*). Apart from *O.*1.14/5, the following Pindaric parallels may be adduced

---

142 The only occurences of the present known to me are *Il.*14.140, Theoc.1.54 and perhaps A.*Ch.*772.

143 A construction with ἐπί may possibly be found in: ὁρῶμεν, ὦ παῖ, κἀπὶ συμφοραῖσί μοι | γεγηθὸς ἕρπει δάκρυον ὀμμάτων ἄπο, S.*El.*1230/1, although ἐπί here is probably to be construed with ἕρπει.

for ἐν "marking the sphere in which an activity takes place": ἐν ἡρωίαιϲ ἀρεταῖϲιν | οὐ ψεύϲομ' ἀμφὶ Κορίνθωι, *O.*13.51/2; ἐν ἔργμαϲιν δὲ νικᾶι τύχα, | οὐ ϲθένοϲ, *fr.*38; ἄμμι δ' ἔοικε Κρόνου ϲειϲίχθον' υἱὸν | ... κελαδῆϲαι, | ... ἐν γναμπτοῖϲ δρόμοιϲ, *I.*1.52-7; see also below, line 58. The difference, however, is that in these passages, unlike the ones cited above, ἐν cannot easily be omitted.

33. ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών

'Having cut a matchless[144] spear'. Peleus' famous spear is used by Achilles in the *Iliad*: ἐκ δ' ἄρα ϲύριγγοϲ πατρώιον ἐϲπάϲατ' ἔγχοϲ | βριθὺ μέγα ϲτιβαρόν· τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ' ἄλλοϲ 'Αχαιῶν | πάλλειν, ἀλλά μιν οἶοϲ ἐπίϲτατο πῆλαι 'Αχιλλεύϲ, Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλωι τάμε Χείρων | Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆϲ, φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεϲϲιν, *Il.*19.387-91. Cf. also *Il.*16.140-4. The spear was Chiron's wedding-gift. The story seems to have been related in detail by the poet of the *Cypria* (see Σ.*ad Il.*16.140). It must have struck Pindar's audience, who were without doubt familiar with both passages in the *Iliad*, that the poet here credits Peleus himself rather than his tutor with the making of this spear. See pp. 207, 229 above.

34. ὃϲ καὶ 'Ιαολκὸν εἷλε μόνοϲ ἄνευ ϲτρατιᾶϲ

The emphasis on the *single-handed* capture of Iolcus is inconsistent with the tradition. The scholiast on this line (57, III 51 Dr.), quoting Pherecydes (*FHG* I 78 J.), as well as Apollod.3.13.7, mentions Jason and the Dioscuri as his helpers. Moreover, Apollodorus mentions an army (Πηλεὺϲ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ϲὺν 'Ιάϲονι καὶ Διοϲκούροιϲ ἐπόρθηϲεν 'Ιωλκόν, καὶ 'Αϲτυδάμειαν τὴν 'Ακάϲτου γυναῖκα φονεύει, καὶ διελὼν μεληδὸν διήγαγε δι' αὐτῆϲ τὸν ϲτρατὸν εἰϲ τὴν πόλιν).[145] See further p. 207 above.

• *Text:* The mss. unanimously read καὶ 'Ιωλκὸν. This goes with the metre (–⏑–⏑ being required), but the hiatus is a problem.[146] Snell-Maehler print καὶ 'Ιαολκὸν, which does not dispose of the hiatus, nor does Turyn's καὶ 'Ιαωλκὸν. The obvious solution is to read καὶ 'Ιαολκὸν, without *synizesis*, which makes the I of 'Ιαολκὸν a consonant. Moreover, there is no positive evidence for the contracted form 'Ιωλκόϲ in Pindar. The name of the Thessalian city is attested five times in Pindar. The mss. offer three forms of the place-name: 'Ιωλκόν here, and in *P.*4.77 (the metre requiring ⏑–×)

---

[144] The adjective **ὑπέραλλοϲ** is a *hapax*. The meaning must be 'above others, superior, matchless'. It is glossed ἐξαίρετον, ἐξέχουϲαν καὶ ὑπερβάλλουϲαν by the scholiast (57, III 51 Dr.).

[145] Pindar mentions the capture of Iolcus also in Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ λατρίαν 'Ιαολκὸν | πολεμίαι χερὶ προϲτραπὼν | Πηλεὺϲ παρέδωκεν Αἱμόνεϲϲιν | δάμαρτοϲ 'Ιππολύταϲ 'Ακάϲτου δολίαιϲ | τέχναιϲι χρηϲαμένου, *N.*4.54-8.

[146] Of the digamma stipulated by Christ, Bergk, and Bury (καὶ ϝιωλκὸν) there is no trace.

and 188 (the metre requiring ⏑⏑–x); Ἰαωλκόϲ in *I*.8.40 (the metre requiring ⏑–x). In *N*.4.54 (the metre requiring ⏑⏑–x) ms. V reads Ἰαολκόν, while B and D read Ἰαωλκόν. The only instance, apart from *h.l.*, of the mss. reading the contracted form where it is metrically possible is *P*.4.77. The difference between the forms Ἰαωλκόϲ and Ἰαολκόϲ is indifferent, in sofar as Pindar himself could not make the difference in writing; however, *synizesis* of two short vowels (αο) is more likely than of a short and a long one (αω). This means that Schroeder was right in adopting Ἰαολκ- in every case for Pindar, writing Ἰα͜ολκ- where necessary. Moreover, M. West, *Glotta* 41, 1963, 278/9, has argued that Ἰαολκόϲ is the oldest form. See also Braswell on *P*.4.77(b). For a more general account on 'pre-Ionic orthography' for Pindar, see Braswell on *P*.4.14(d).

35-36. καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν | ἐγκονητί

'And he caught the sea-goddess Thetis with great effort.' The verb κατέμαρψεν has connotations of hostility and it implies that Thetis was making efforts to escape from Peleus' embrace. ἐγκονητί means 'raising dust', i.e. with great effort. The allusions to Thetis' resistance[147] by means of κατέμαρψεν and ἐγκονητί add to the glory of Peleus' achievement.

The *simplex* μάρπτω means 'to take hold of', often with connotations of hostility, 'to lay hold of, to seize' (cf. *N*.1.44/5, *Od*.10.116/7,, *Il*.21.563-5, cf. also 22.201, etc.; metaphorically in *N*.6.9-11 of fields lying bare, 'withholding' their strength). The *compositum* **καταμάρπτω** means 'to catch and bring down', in spite of someone's (the object's) efforts to escape. It is used mainly for 'catching, overtaking' someone running away.[148]

Cf. τὸν μὲν Μηριόνηϲ, ὅτε δὴ κατέμαρπτε διώκων, | βέβληκει γλουτὸν κάτα δεξιόν, *Il*.5.65/6, cf. 16.598; ἐπεὶ κατὰ γῆραϲ ἔμαρψεν, *Od*.24.390; ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν αὐτὸϲ ἔτειϲε κακὸν χρέοϲ, οὐδὲ φίλοιϲι | ἄτην ἐξοπίϲω παιϲὶν ἐπεκρέμαϲεν· | ἄλλον δ' οὐ κατέμαρψε δίκη· θάνατοϲ γὰρ ἀναιδὴϲ | πρόϲθεν ἐπὶ βλεφάροιϲ ἕζετο κῆρα φέρων, Thgn.205-8. Pindar uses the verb twice, apart from *h.l.*: ἔϲτιν δ' ἀφάνεια τύχαϲ καὶ μαρναμένων, | πρὶν τέλοϲ ἱκέϲθαι· | τῶν τε γὰρ καὶ τῶν διδοῖ {τέλοϲ}· | καὶ κρέϲϲον' ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων | ἔϲφαλε τέχνα καταμάρψαιϲ', *I*.4.31-5, where the 'skill' of inferior men is said to be able to kill

[147] For the story see: πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲϲ θραϲυμαχάνων τε λεόντων | ὄνυχαϲ ὀξυτάτουϲ ἀκμὰν | καὶ δεινοτάτων ϲχάϲαιϲ ὀδόντων | ἔγαμεν ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρεΐδων, *N*.4.62-5; ἔγημεν ὡϲ ἔγημεν ἀφθόγγουϲ γάμουϲ | τῆι παντομόρφωι Θέτιδι ϲυμπλακείϲ ποτε, S.*fr*.618 R; [Peleus speaks:] τίϲ γάρ με μόχθουϲ –⏑ οὐκ ἐπεϲτάτει; λέων δράκων τε, πῦρ, ὕδωρ, S.*fr*.150 R; Χείρωνοϲ οὖν ὑποθεμένου Πηλεῖ ϲυλλαβεῖν καὶ καταϲχεῖν αὐτὴν μεταμορφουμένην, ἐπιτηρήϲαϲ ϲυναρπάζει, γινομένην δὲ ὁτὲ μὲν πῦρ ὁτὲ δὲ ὕδωρ ὁτὲ δὲ θηρίον οὐ πρότερον ἀνῆκε πρὶν ἢ τὴν ἀρχαίαν μορφὴν εἶδεν ἀπολαβοῦϲαν, Apollod.3.13.5; Ov.*Met*.11.221-65; Paus.5.18.1; cf. Hdt.7.191, Σ.*ad* A.R.1.58c; Philostrat.*Her*.19.1.

[148] The verb would be more than adequate to refer to the act of 'tackling' someone in a game of football.

even a stronger man by 'overtaking, surpassing' him, i.e. by means of τέχνα an inferior man is able to make up for his arrears and bring down his superior. This *gnome* is exemplified by the story of Odysseus bringing down Ajax. In ἐπεὶ κατὰ γαῖ' αὐτόν τέ νιν (*sc.* Ἀμφιάρηον) καὶ φαιδίμας ἵππους ἔμαρψεν, *O.*6.14, referring to Amphiaraus being swallowed by the earth, the choice for the verb is motivated by the fact that it enables the poet to allude to the fact that Amphiaraus was fleeing[149]; the earth 'overtook him and brought him down.'

The adverb **ἐγκονητί** occurs only *h.l.* The verb ἐγκονέω literally means 'to raise dust', as an emblem for doing things eagerly or in haste (*Od.*7.340, *Il.*24.648, A.*Pr.*961/2, E.*HF* 520-2; cf. also S.*Aj.*811, 988, *Tr.*1255, Ar.*Ach.*1088, *Av.*1324, etc.). The adverb here evokes associations with wrestling and the pancration (cf. the Σ.*ad h.l.*: ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθλευόντων, 61a, III 52 Dr.). Peleus' struggle with Thetis is often described in terms of a wrestling or pancration match (cf. the occurrance of phrases like παγκρατές, *N.*4.62; συμπλακείς, S.*fr.*618 R; συλλαβεῖν and συναρπάζει, Apollod.3.13.5, all quoted in n. 147 above). The noun κόνις and the verb κονίζειν are often used in descriptions of combat sports.

Cf. οὕτω δ' Ἀτρέως παῖδας ὁ κρείσσων | ἐπ' Ἀλεχάνδρωι πέμπει ξένιος | Ζεὺς πολυάνορος ἀμφὶ γυναικός, | πολλὰ παλαίσματα καὶ γυιοβαρῆ, | γόνατος κονίαισιν ἐρειδομένου | διακναιομένης τ' ἐν προτελείοις | κάμακος, θήσων Δαναοῖσιν | Τρωσί θ' ὁμοίως, A.*Ag.*60-7 ("Although being on the knees is most precarious for the wrestler underneath, since he is in imminent danger of a fall, it is also more of an exercise of strength and endurance for the wrestler in control than upright wrestling ... This notion of increased labour for both parties underlies the image in A.*Ag.*63 ff.", M.B. Poliakoff, *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*, Meisenheim 1982, 118/9); τοὺς τρισσοὺς συνομάλικας εἰς κόνιν ἀπτὼς ἤρεισα, τέχναι γαῦρος οὐ κεναῖ γεγώς, *Inscr. Priene* (Ebert, 73); τὸ τρίτον οὐκ ἐκόνισσεν ἐπωμίδας, ἀλλὰ παλαίσας | ἀπτὼς τοὺς τρισσοὺς Ἰσθμόθεν εἶλε πόνους, *AP* 9.588 (Alcaeus of Messenia, [= Ebert, 67]); τίνι δ' οὐκ ἐγήδρευεν ἡ τύχη διαπνέουσα καὶ συλλεγομένη ῥώμην ἵνα συμπλακεῖσα εὐθὺς ἐξαρπάσηι πρὶν φθάσαι τὸν ἀντίπαλον κονίσασθαι, Ph.*Somn.*2.146, where the many hazards waiting for a person are described in wrestling terminology.

The qualification **ποντία** is also given to Thetis in *N.*5.36, *I.*8.34, and *Pae.*6.83. In *P.*11.2 it qualifies the Nereids, of whom Thetis was a prominent member.[150]

---

[149] Cf. ὁ δ' Ἀμφιαρεῖ σχίσσεν κεραυνῶι παμβίαι | Ζεὺς τὰν βαθύστερνον χθόνα, κρύψεν δ' ἅμ' ἵπποις, | δουρὶ Περικλυμένου πρὶν νῶτα τυπέντα μαχατὰν | θυμὸν αἰσχυνθῆμεν, *N.*9.24-7; λέγεται δὲ Ἀμφιαράωι φεύγοντι Θηβῶν διαστῆναι τὴν γῆν καὶ ὡς αὐτὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸ ἅρμα ὑπεδέξατο, Paus.1.34.2.

[150] The adjective does not occur in the epic, except for *h.Hom.*22.3, where it is an epithet of Poseidon (cf. *Pae.*9.47, B.17.35). It is relatively frequent in Pindar, occurring sixteen times.

36-40

Telamon of wide strength sacked Laomedon, being Iolas' comrade in arms, and he followed him once in pursuit of the valorous bronze-bowed Amazons and never did terror that conquers man stop the point of his spirit.

36-37. Λαομέδοντα δ' εὐρυcθενὴc | Τελάμων ... ἔπερcεν

Laomedon was the father of Priam and king of Troy before him. Heracles, cheated by him (cf. D.S.4.42, Apollod.2.5.9, Tz.*Lycophr.*34, Valerius Flaccus 2.487, Hyginus *Fab.*89, Σ.*ad Il.*20.146), made war on Troy. Apart from his own Tirynthians, his allies were his nephew Iolaus, Telamon, Peleus, the Argive Oicles, and the Boeotian Deimachus (cf. *I.*6.27-35, *I.*5.35-8, *N.*4.25, *I.*1.16, *Od.*15.243, Σ.*ad h.l.*, Apollod.1.8.2, 2.6.4, Plut.*Quaest. Gr.*41). The first to breach the wall and enter was Telamon, who chose the western curtain built by his father Aeacus as the weakest spot, as it had been prophesized (cf. *O.*8.31-52). In spite of what is told here, it was Heracles who killed Laomedon and burnt Troy, according to most accounts (*Il.*5.638-65, D.S.4.32, Tz.*Lycophr.*337, Apollod.2.6.4, Ov.*Met.*11-213-7, 13.22 ff., Hyginus *Fab.*89).

The most striking characteristic of the short allusion to the sack of Troy by Heracles and his companions here is that Heracles himself is not mentioned al all. The killing of Laomedon is attributed to Telamon here, instead of to Heracles, and, instead of at least mentioning Heracles as Telamon's comrade in war (although he was in fact the leader of the expedition, cf. *N.*4.25, *I.*5.37) Pindar only mentions Iolaus, Heracles' charioteer (cf. Σ.*ad h.l.*). See further interpretation, pp. 208/9, 227/8.

πέρθω, 'destroy, sack,' of cities, is all but the κυρίον ὄνομα for the sack of Troy.

Cf., e.g., ὃc Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρcεν, *P.*1.54; Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πράθεν, *N.*7.35; τοὶ καὶ cὺν μάχαιc | δὶc πόλιν Τρώων πράθον, *I.*5.35/6; *Pae.*6.91, B.11.120/1, A.*Th.*325, etc. In Homer the verb is always used literally, with an object referring to a city (cf. *Il.*18.342, *Od.*1.2, etc.).

By means of this verb Laomedon as a person is presented as a symbol for the city of Troy as a whole.

The verb is also used metaphorically—with a plural personal object—in ὅτι πρόcθε ποτὲ Τιρύνθιον | ἔπερcαν αὐτῶι cτρατὸν | μυχοῖc ἥμενον Ἄλιδοc | Μολίονεc ὑπερφίαλοι, *O.*10.31-4, where the Tirynthian army represents the city, as also appears from the fact that Heracles' retribution consisted of destroying Augeas' city; cf. also S.*Aj.*1198. For the metaphorical usage with an object referring to one person, cf. καίτοι τοcοῦτόν γ' οἶδα, μήτε μ' ἂν νόcον | μήτ' ἄλλο πέρcαι μηδέν· οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε | θνήιcκων ἐcώιθην, μὴ 'πί τωι δεινῶι κακῶι, S.*OT* 1455-7, where the choice for πέρcαι may reflect Oedipus' identification with the city of Thebes that is perspicuous in the entire play. Cf. also the even more stiking occurrance of the verb in

Εὐρυcθῆος ἐπεὶ κεφαλὰν | ἔπραθε φαcγάνου ἀκμᾶι (*sc.* Ἰόλαος), *P.*9.80/1, where the choice for the verb might be understood by realizing that Eurystheus' execution meant the defeat of an entire army. The verb is used as a metaphor (with an impersonal subject) for the destroying effects of illness in: ἢ θερινῶι πυρὶ περθόμενοι δέμας ἢ χειμῶνι, *P.*3.50; cf. also E.*Hipp.*542.

• *Coordination:* **δ'** marks this sentence as a next, independent step in the sequence. It is striking that the *topic* of this sentence (Telamon, as opposed to the preceding *topic* Peleus) is not explicitly introduced as such. The marked position for this, directly before δ', is taken by a reference to Laomedon, a king of Troy. This would have been understandible, to some extent, if the reference to Laomedon in itself had been suggestive of Telamon. But this is not the case. If the audience had associated any hero with Laomedon, it would have been Heracles (see above for the mythological background of this passage). So the placement of Λαομέδοντα before δ' not only obscures the *topic*-distribution in this passage, but is also suggestive of the hero who was explicitly rejected as an suitable personage in an ode for an Aeginetan victor.

For **εὐρυcθενής** see my note on *N.*5.4, p. 104.

37. Ἰόλαι παραcτάταc ἐών

Telamon was 'Iolaus' flank officer, his comrade in arms.' This implies that Iolaus was the leader of the expedition and that Telamon was serving under his command. This is striking, since in fact Heracles was the leader of this expedition against Troy. Moreover, if Pindar wished to highlight the achievements of Telamon by not mentioning Heracles, it is even more striking that he does present Telamon as serving under the command exactly of the man who is primarily known as Heracles' serving officer.[151] See further interpretation, pp. 208/9, 227/8.

The noun **παραcτάταc**, 'comrade in arms', occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar, but cf. A.*Pers.*957, of Xerxes' generals; S.*Ant.*671, Hdt.6.107, etc. As a technical military term the noun refers to the officer in charge of the flank, as opposed to the προcτάτηc, the 'front-rank-man,' and the ἐπιcτάτηc, the 'rear-rank-man'; cf., e.g., Hdt.6.117, X.*Cyr.*3.3.59, 8.1.10, etc.

---

[151] Iolaus was the son of Iphicles (cf. *P.*11.59), son of Amphitryon and Alcmene, and therefore half-brother of Heracles (cf. *P.*9.88, *I.*1.30). During the expedition against Troy he served as Heracles' charioteer (cf. Σ.*ad h.l.*). He had his tomb in Thebes, where games were held in his honour (cf. *O.*9.98, *I.*5.32, etc.).

Epode B

38-39. καί ποτε χαλκότοξον 'Αμαζόνων μετ' ἀλκὰν | ἕπετό οἱ
'And once he (Telamon) followed him (Iolaus) in pursuit of the valorous bronze-bowed Amazons.' Since there is no signal for a change of subject, the subject of ἕπετο is the same as the subject of ἔπερϲεν in the preceding line. οἱ consequently refers to Iolaus. Telamon is presented as following the lead of Iolaus in an expedition against the Amazons.

Pindar here adapts the traditional version of the myth, in the same fashion as in his account of the capture of Troy in the preceding sentence. The expedition against the Amazons, in which Telamon played his role, took place under the lead of Heracles. In fact, the fetching of Hippolyta's girdle has been canonized as Heracles' ninth labour.[152] Among his comrades were, apart from Telamon, Iolaus, Peleus, and, according to some accounts, Theseus (cf. Σ.*ad h.l.*, quoting Hes.*fr.*278; *fr.*172, Apollod.2.5.9, Plut.*Thes.*26, Justin.2.4, *fr.*174 [Paus.7.2.6]). Moreover, tradition has hardly recorded any special merit on the part of Telamon in the course of this expedition and none on the part of of Iolaus. According to most accounts Heracles himself single handedly killed each of the Amazon leaders (D.S.4.16, Apollod.2.5.9, Plut.*Quaest. Gr.*45). Only the Hesiod passage (*fr.*278) quoted by the scholiast (64b, III 52 Dr.) records that Telamon killed Melanippe, Hippolyta's sister.

The sack of Troy and the killing of Laomedon, mentioned in the preceding lines, chronologically took place after the battle with the Amazons. **ποτε**, 'at another occasion,' signals that the story moves from one episode in the past to an earlier one (cf. πρότεροι in *P.*8.48, and see my note on πρότεροι, line 13, p. 270).

χαλκότοξον[153] is a *hapax*. In the extant works of Pindar nineteen different composite nouns and adjectives derived from χαλκόϲ occur, of which ten[154] are not attested in any other classical author. Arms are often made of bronze. It is unnecessary to specify whether the adjective denotes that the Amazons really used bows made out of

---

[152] For the expedition of Heracles to fetch the belt of the Amazon queen cf. also E.*HF* 408 ff., A.R.2.777 ff., 966 ff., with the Σ.*ad* 778, 780, Apollod.2.5.9, D.S.4.16, Paus.5.10.9, Q.S.6.240 ff., Tz.*Lycophr.*1327, *Chil.*2.309 ff., Hyginus *Fab.*30. On the Amazons in general see: J.H. Blok, *Amazones antianeirai. Interpretaties van de Amazonenmythe in het mythologisch onderzoek van de 19e en 20e eeuw en in archaïsch Griekenland*, Diss. Leiden 1991. Further references are to be found there.

[153] The reading of V (χαλκότοξον) resulting in *enallage* is clearly *difficilior* and therefore preferable to the reading χαλκοτόξων of B and D.

[154] Χαλκάρματοϲ, χαλκεντήϲ, χαλκέοψ, χαλκοάραϲ, χαλκόγενυϲ, χαλκοδάμαϲ, χαλκομίτραϲ, χαλκόπεδοϲ, χαλκότοξοϲ, and χαλκοχάρμαϲ.

bronze, or that they used brazen arrows, or that their arrows just had bronze points. The adjective simply associates the Amazons with the notions 'bronze' (evoking associations of the battle-field) and 'archery'. In *O.*13.87-9 the Amazons are described as Ἀμαζονίδων | ... | τοξόταν ... γυναικεῖον στρατόν.[155]

For **ἀλκά** with a genitive as a periphrasis for a 'valorous' person, cf. *I.*4.35. This periphrasis does not occur in other authors and it may be a coinage by Pindar, modelled on the common Homeric periphrasis with βία (cf. βία Φώκου κρέοντος, *N.*5.12, with my note, p. 116). For **μετά** in the sense 'after, in pursuit of' (common in Homer), cf. καὶ μετὰ ζωστῆρας Ἀμαζόνος ἤλθεν, *fr.*172.5; *O.*4.23, *P.*4.68/9, *P.*9.106, *fr.*74. Cf. also E.*Alc.*46, 66, *Heracl.*217, *Suppl.*670, *Ph.*1317. See also Schwyzer, ii 485/6. For the correption of **οἱ**, cf. ἐκ νεφέων δέ οἱ ἀντάϋσε, *P.*4.197. For 'epic' correption in Pindar more generally, see Braswell on *P.*4.5(c). The sole parallel for the position of οἱ at the very end of a clause is Ζεὺς δ' ἀντίος ἤλυθέ οἱ, | καὶ τόδ' ἐξαύδασ' ἔπος, *N.*10.79/80; this instance is, however, less unusal by far, as only a subject and predicate precede the pronoun, whereas in our sentence here two adverbial phrases and the predicate are preceding οἱ.

39. οὐδέ μίν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν

'And never did fear that conquers men stop the point of his spirit,' i.e., Telamon never was victim to fear, to the effect that his courage slackened. The phrase **ἀκμὰ φρενῶν**[156] is unparalleled. Literally it means 'the point of his spirits,' and from the sentence as a whole it is clear that this must refer to Telamon's courage, to his fighting-spirit.[157] It is, however, not clear exactly how ἀκμά conveys this meaning.[158] ἀκμά (meaning 'point, edge,' especially of swords and spears, *v.i.*) evokes associations of 'sharpness.' The idea of a 'sharp spirit' is not uncommon. ὀξύς is frequently found as a qualification of a man's spirit, denoting that it is 'passionate,' especially 'quick to anger,' which is, of course, a virtue for a warrior.

Cf. καὶ ψυχῆς ἀπατηλὸν ὑπογνάμψαι φρεσὶν ὁρμὴν | θυμοῦ τ' αὖ μένος ὀξὺ κατισχέμεν ὅς μ' ἐρέθῃσι | φυλόπιδος κρυερῆς ἐπιβαινέμεν, *h.Hom.*13-5, in a prayer to Ares for peace; μένος ὀξύ is the fighting spirit which the poet

---

[155] In *O.*8.47 they are εὔιπποι.

[156] The reading ἀλκὰν of B and D is either a diplography from the preceding line or a glosse. V's ἀκμὰν is clearly *difficilior*. The same *varia lectio* occurs in *O.*2.63, where only B has ἀλκᾶι, which is, moreover, unmetrical in that passage (see also Van Leeuwen *ad loc.*, I, p. 187).

[157] Cf. οὐδέποτε δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀνδρείαν ἐκ τῶν φρενῶν φόβος τις ἔπαυσεν, Σ.*ad loc.* (66b, III 53 Dr.).

[158] The *tenor* of the sentence is 'never did fear stop his fighting-spirit'. The *vehicle* is ἀκμά, borrowed from the terminology of arms. The *suppressed tenor* must be a word referring to 'courage' or '(mental) strength'. The problem is to define the *ground.*

wishes to be restrained. ὀξύϲ is a fixed epithet for Ares (*Il.*2.440, etc.; cf. also Tyrt.20.15 W). In non-martial spheres a passionate mind quick to anger is of course not always considered a virtue. Cf. e.g. εἰϲὶ χἀτέροιϲ γοναὶ κακαὶ | καὶ θυμὸϲ ὀξύϲ, ἀλλὰ νουθετούμενοι | φίλων ἐπῳδαῖϲ ἐξεπᾴδονται φύϲιν, S.*OC* 1192-4; cf. also Thgn.366, 1030. Cf. also ὀξύθυμοϲ (e.g. E.*Med.*319), ὀξυθυμέω (e.g. E.*Andr.*689), ὀξυκάρδιοϲ (A.*Th.*906).

This idea provides the *ground* of the metaphor. Telamon is said to have a 'pointed,' a 'sharp' spirit, i.e., a passionate temperament, fit for a warrior. So 'fear never stopped the point of his spirit' means 'fear never quelled his passion, his fierce spirit.' The charm of this metaphor is that the literal meaning of ἀκμά is relevant as well. Although the genitive qualification φρενῶν limits the reference of ἀκμά to the mental sphere, the noun still does evoke associations with actual points of real spears and swords. Thus also the idea that 'fear never stopped Telamon's point,' i.e., the point of his spear, comes to mind. And this idea may be called the concrete, visible consequence of Telamon's mental stability. This is the *target* of the metaphor.

For **ἀκμά** literally referring to a 'point, edge' cf.: ἐγχέων ἀκμάν, *P.*1.11, *N.*6.52, *P.*9.81, *N.*10.60; θραϲυμαχάνων τε λεόντων | ὄνυχαϲ ὀξυτάτουϲ ἀκμὰν | καὶ δεινοτάτων ϲχάϲαιϲ ὀδόντων, *N.*4.62-4. Metaphorically it can refer to the 'highest point,' the 'top,' of something, as in ὕδατοϲ ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοιϲαν εἰϲ ἀκμὰν | μαχαίραι τάμον κατὰ μέλη, *O.*1.48/9, 'the boiling top of water' (cf. Bers, *Enallage*, p. 46). On a more abstract level ἀκμά may be used metaphorically to refer to the 'highest, culminating point,' i.e., 'zenith, prime.' This may be the 'prime' of a season, as in: ἦ μάλα δὴ μετὰ καὶ νῦν, ὥτε φοινικανθέμου ἦροϲ ἀκμᾶι, | παιϲὶ τούτοιϲ ὄγδοον θάλλει μέροϲ Ἀρκεϲίλαϲ, *P.*4.64/5; cf., e.g., ἀκμὴ θέρουϲ, X.*HG* 5.3.19; cf. also phrases like ἀκμὴ ἥβηϲ, S.*OT* 741. Or the prime of strength, as in: ἵνα ταχυτὰϲ ποδῶν ἐρίζεται | ἀκμαί τ' ἰϲχύοϲ θραϲύπονοι, *O.*1.95/6, "'peaks of strength' is Pindar's way of saying 'greatest strengths' (ἀκμαῖαι ἰϲχύεϲ), which in turn is the abstract equivalent of the 'strongest' (ἰϲχυρότατοι)," Gerber *ad loc.* (p. 148). Cf. also phrases like ἀκμὴ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ, Th.8.46, 'the flower of their navy.' If De Pauw's conjecture is accepted, we have one occurance of ἀκμά without a genitive: οὐ γὰρ φύϲιν Ὠαριωνείαν ἔλαχεν· | ἀλλ' ὀνοτὸϲ μὲν ἰδέϲθαι, | ϲυμπεϲεῖν δ' ἀκμᾶι[159] βαρύϲ, *I.*4.49-51. This is, however, very difficult to understand and I am not sure whether De Pauw's conjecture is correct (cf. Willcock *ad loc.*, p. 83).

There are a number of passages where ἀκμά is qualified by a genitive referring to feet or hands. Cf. υἱὸν εἰϲιδέτω θανόντ' ἐν πολέμωι, | χεῖραϲ Ἄρεΐ ⟨τ'⟩ ἐναλίγκιον ϲτεροπαῖϲί τ' ἀκμὰν ποδῶν, *I.*8.36/7; cf. μάλα γὰρ οὖν ἁλομένα | ἀνέκαθεν βαρυπετῆ | καταφέρω ποδὸϲ ἀκμάν, | ϲφαλερὰ ⟨καὶ⟩ τανυδρόμοιϲ | κῶλα, δύϲφορον ἄταν, A.*Eu.*372-6; ἀπονέϲτερον | ἐϲλοὶ δέκονται βίοτον, οὐ χθόνα ταράϲϲοντεϲ ἐν χερὸϲ ἀκμᾶι | οὐδὲ πόντιον ὕδωρ | κεινὰν παρὰ δίαιταν,

---

[159] De Pauw: αἰχμᾶι codd. contr. metr.

O.2.62-5; cf. πέπλον δ' ἔρεικε κολπίαν ἀκμᾶι χερῶν, A.*Pers*.1060. Here ἀκμά is traditionally rendered with 'speed' or 'strength' respectively. This interpretation is semantically problematic. Starting from the denotation of the noun, the most natural way to interpret these phrases is that they have reference to the 'points, edges' of hands and feet, i.e., to 'fingers' and 'soles' (or 'toes', or 'heels') of the feet, as clearly in λύω ϲ' ἔχοντα διατόρουϲ ποδοῖν ἀκμάϲ, S.*OT* 1034. Apart from the semantic considerations, the notion 'strength' is not extremely relevant in A.*Pers*.1060. In *O*.2.63 the picture of digging in the earth with one's very fingers adds to the misery of this way of life. In A.*Eu*.372-6 the qualification βαρυπετῆ seems to indicate that 'speed' is not the relevant factor here, but rather the image of being crushed under the soles of the Eumenids' feet. Admittedly, in *I*.8.36/7 speed is the relevant factor, but this is made clear by ϲτεροπαῖϲι rather than by ἀκμάν ('a son being like Ares as for his hands and like the lighning as for the soles of his feet').

ἀνδροδάμαϲ means 'mastering, subduing men.' The adjective also occurs in ἀνδροδάμαντ'[160] Ἐριφύλαν, *N*.9.16, where Eriphyle is thus described since she was responsible for the death of her husband Amphiaraus (cf. Σ. *ad loc.*). The adjective has been plausibly restored (by Casaubon and Boeckh) in ⟨ἀνδρ⟩οδάμαν⟨τα⟩ δ' ἐπεὶ Φῆρεϲ δάεν | ῥιπὰν μελιαδέοϲ οἴνου, *fr*.166.1/2. The adjective may be a Pindaric coinage. For **παύω** used to refer to the 'quelling' of someone's temper, cf. ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δεῖμα μὲν παροιχομένων | κρατερὰν ἔπαυϲε μέριμναν, *I*.8.12; ἐγὼ παύω χόλον, *Il*.19.67; ϲὺ δὲ παῦε τεὸν μένοϲ, *Il*.1.282, etc. For the double accusative with ἔπαυϲεν see Christ, p. 254; Farnel, *ad loc.* (II, p. 258); E.B. Clapp, 'Pindar's Accusative Constructions', *TAPhA* 32, 1901, 16-42, esp. p. 38; B. Jacquinod, *Le double accusatif en grec d' Homère à la fin du Vᵉ siècle avant J.-C.*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1989; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 99/100. For the effect of **φόβοϲ** upon someone's **φρένεϲ**, cf. φόβωι δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένεϲ, *P*.9.32. Cf. also ἐν τεϲϲαράκοντα γάρ | πετόντεϲϲιν ἀνιόχοιϲ ὅλον | δίφρον κομίξαιϲ ἀταρβεῖ φρενί, κτλ, *P*.5.49-51; θάρϲει, Δαρδανίδη Πρίαμε, φρεϲὶ μηδέ τι τάρβει, *Il*.24.171; ἤ τιϲ δὴ τέτληκε τόϲα φρεϲίν, ὅϲϲα τ' ἐγώ περ, *Od*.19.347. See further my note on ἐν φραϲὶ πάξαιθ', line 62 below. For my preferance of the mss. reading **μίν** to Mommsen's conjecture νίν, see my note on *N*.5.31 μιν, pp. 154/5.

40-42

Through inborn glory one has the preponderance. Who has things learned, is a man in the dark, now breathing this, then that. He does not ever step down with sure foot and he has a taste of countless ways to distinguish himself with his ineffectual mind.

40-42

ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία is contrasted to διδακτά. By means of the former a man is able to get the 'preponderance,' the opportunities to achieve

---

[160] B: ἀνδρομάδαν τ' D: ἀνδροδάμαν δ' Schneidewin.

great things, while a man possessing the latter finds himself in the dark (ψεφηνός), trying to satisfy various ambitions, but without success. The emphasis upon the all-importance of συγγενὴς εὐδοξία interrelates the three Aeacid stories. Many of the details Pindar selects to relate in each of the three stories emphasize the continuity of qualities within the family. Moreover, συγγενὴς εὐδοξία entails the highly complimentary suggestion that Aristoclidas' victory is a continuation of the successes of his illustrious ancestors· Many of the details in the Aeacids' stories aim at suggesting parallels between these great deeds of past times and Aristoclidas' victory. See further pp. 207/8, 210/1 above.

διδακτά in this connection refers to capacities that are 'learned' to the extent that they are alien to one's γένος. Lines 53-5 below show that διδακτά here does not imply a rejection of learning *tout court* (for the other odes, cf. trainer passages; cf. also *O.*10.20/1). On the contrary, if it is added to inborn capacities it becomes a potent force. Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, pp. 108/9, interestingly suggests that "we can say that *phya* uncontaminated by the training of *techne* (whether the poet's or the athlete's) is just as ineffectual as learning (*techne*) without inborn aptitude (*phya*). The fact that Pindar may polemicize against the latter imbalance more than against the former only reflects the nature of his intellectual opponents; some sophists may have claimed the universal possibility of education (regardless of birth or class), but no one—not even the most self-concious aristocrat—would claim that birth was alone sufficient for achievement, regardless of training." One may object against the all too easy equation of τέχνη and διδακτά. But Hubbard is certainly right that Pindar's emphasis upon the all importance of inborn qualities is polemic rather than that it represents a balanced view of how things really need to be; and that it reflects the aristocratic beliefs of his commissioners and audiences, who saw their values being threatened by the rising popularity and success of more democratic and populistic forces.

The contast between συγγενὴς εὐδοξία and διδακτά is to be compared with to gnomic passages in other odes where the contrast is between learning and φυά:

(1) πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη | ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας | φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν ἑρμανέων | χατίζει. σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ· μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι | παγγλωσσίαι κόρακες ὣς ἄκραντα γαρυέτων | Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον, *O.*2.83-8. The opposition here is between ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ, who is σοφός, and the μάθοντες. The lack of success of the latter alluded to by means of ἄκραντα, and their inferiority to the former is made clear by means of the simile of 'chattering

crows,' who are contrasted to the superior eagle. The gnomic formulation of this idea is meant to be applicable both to the contrast between Pindar and his rivals and to the contrast between Theron and inferior citizens. See *CPh* 89, 1994, 311-3. The emphasis upon φυά as being crucial for success thus both reflects a self-concious claim on the part of the poet about his natural 'talent' for his art—as contrasted to his rivals, μαθόντες, who try to imitate him without possessing the same talent—, and it places Theron firmly in the aristocratic value system, suggesting that he was born to win and born to rule and that those denying him his rights are μαθόντες, who want to take his place without possessing the necessary abilities.[161] Cf. also lines 95-8, which seem to suggest that Theron's position as a tyrant was challenged. For the emphasis upon knowledge (εἰδώς, σόφος) see below sub (3).

(2) τὸ δὲ φυᾷ κράτιστον ἅπαν· πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς | ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος | ὤρουσαν ἀρέσθαι· | ἄνευ δὲ θεοῦ σεσιγαμένον | οὐ σκαιότερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον· ἐντὶ γὰρ ἄλλαι | ὁδῶν ὁδοὶ περαίτεραι, | μία δ' οὐχ ἅπαντας ἄμμε θρέψει | μελέτα· σοφίαι μὲν | αἰπειναί, *O*.9.100-8. Here the opposition is between τὸ φυᾷ and διδακταί ἀρεταί. The former is κράτιστον, 'strongest, most effective.' Many people attempt to attain κλέος by means of 'learned' ἀρεταί, and that they fail to do so is not expressed explicitly, but implied by the emphasis on their 'striving, attempting' (ὤρουσαν). Here the opposition is related to divine power, identified as the source of inborn capacities.[162] Everything that is done 'without θεός' is better kept silent. The victor, Epharmostus, is said in line 110 to possess his qualities δαιμονίαι. The gods traditionally play a major role in the dispensation of qualities from Homer onward; the connection of φυά with divine power is also directly applicable to the political implications of the idea. Aristocratic families justified their superiority by tracing back their lineage to the gods. It is also applicable to the poetical implications, since Pindar often declares his dependance from divine inspiration. The fact that Pindar assures his audience—and especially his commisioners—that his poetry has not been void of divine assistance is meant as a guarantee for the superior quality of his poetry.

However, the relation (as indicated by γάρ, 104) between this and the statement in the subsequent lines, about 'some roads leading fur-

---

[161] Hubbard, *Pindarc Mind*, p. 107, usefully reminds us that Pindar extends the usage of φυά to include not only bodily characteristics, but also internal qualities of character (cf. also *P*.8.44, *N*.7.54, etc. Contrast B.5.168 cited below).

[162] Cf. ἀγαθοὶ δὲ καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμον' ἄνδρες | ἐγένοντ', *O*.9.28/9; ἐκ θεῶν γὰρ μαχαναὶ πᾶσαι βροτέαις ἀρεταῖς, | καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ χερσὶ βιαταὶ περίγλωσσοί τ' ἔφυν, *P*.1.41/2; σοφοὶ δέ τοι κάλλιον | φέροντι καὶ τὰν θεόσδοτον δύναμιν, *P*.5.12/3.

ther than others' and σοφίαι being 'steep', is not immediately clear.[163] In order to understand this it is helpful to adduce one more passage:

(3) τέχναι δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι· χρὴ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾷ. | πράσσει γὰρ ἔργῳ μὲν σθένος, | βουλαῖσι δὲ φρήν, ἐσσόμενον προϊδεῖν | συγγενὲς οἷς ἕπεται, *N.*1.25-8. Here the emphasis is quite different. These lines clearly express the thought that every craft demands its own specific talents. The right thing to do is to stick to what one is good at, confining oneself exclusively to those crafts for which one possesses the necessary physical or mental capacities.

Braswell (*ad loc.*, p. 51) is right (*pace* Carey *ad loc.*) that ἐσσόμενον προϊδεῖν | συγγενὲς οἷς ἕπεται does not necessarily imply μαντεία. The γάρ clause explicitly applies the preceding dogma to both physical strength and intellectual ability, balanced by μέν ... δέ. The absence of δέ after ἐσσόμενον shows that the phrase qualifies the second example rather than being a new third example. "What makes a good counsellor is precisely the ability to anticipate what is going to happen in any given situation," Braswell, who helpfully quotes *N.*9.37-9, D.L.1.78, and *Il.*1.343/4. This also explains the emphasis upon knowledge (εἰδώς, σόφος) in *O.*2, see above sub (1).

One has to 'strive[164] in accordance with one's φυά,' in accordance with one's inborn nature. ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα is an image for the desirable confinement to those crafts for which one has the right φυά. A man must follow his φυά, by sticking to his talents, without diverting from the straight road by trying his luck in other activities for which he does not have the right φυά.

This explains the relevance of ἐντὶ γὰρ ἄλλαι | ὁδῶν ὁδοὶ περαίτεραι, | μία δ' οὐχ ἅπαντας ἄμμε θρέψει | μελέτα· σοφίαι μὲν | αἰπειναί, *O.*9.104-8. When τὸ φυᾷ is κράτιστον (100), meaning, along the lines of *N.*1.25-8, that it is most effective to act in accordance to one's inborn qualities, this applies to every human activity. There are numerous roads leading to κλέος, but 'some roads lead further than others.' There are many crafts and activities which a man may choose in order to obtain κλέος, but only the one that fits his φυά will be successful.

In *O.*9 and *N.*1 the emphasis is upon the idea 'let the cobbler stick to his last,' 'every man to his trade.' A man is born with a certain φυά, certain physical and mental capacities, which enable him to be successful in only certain activities. He has to stick to those that fit

---

[163] As it is admitted, e.g., by Thummer, *Religiosität*, p. 67 n. 2.

[164] For μάρνασθαι, see my note on *N.*5.47.

his φυά and he must not try to do other things for which he lacks the abilities. The idea has far-reaching political implications. Only those men should rule who have the right φυά for it. A man's φυά is determined by his birth. Only those who are born rulers have the right to foster political ambitions. The whole concept is a categorical denial of social mobility. It is *suum cuique* to its ultimate conclusion. The link between the victory celebrated and the victor's mythical ancestors, in combination with such passages that emphasise the superiority of inborn qualities and deny certain rights to those who do not possess them, implies as a powerful justification of the victor's social status. His victory proves that he possesses the φυά of his ancestors, this φυά gives him certain privileges, and those who do not possess the same φυά must not have the same ambitions.

It is remarkable that the positive side of the opposition here is not expressed in terms of φυά, but of cυγγενὴc εὐδοξία, the 'glory that goes with the γένοc,' which is 'inborn, inherited.' By means of cυγγενήc Pindar here expresses the hereditary character of qualities even more poignantly than in comparable passages in other odes.

Bacchylides nowhere emphasises the importance of inborn abilities for success. The noun φυά occurs only once, in cοὶ φυὰν ἀλιγκία, B.5.168, in an entirely Homeric, non-pregnant sense. Also in this respect, Pindar places himself far more explicitly in aristocratic traditions than his contemporary (see also my note on line 19 above, and my *CQ* 45, 1995, 328, 332).

• *Literature:* I confine myself to a small selection from the enormous number of discussions of this idea and the passages quoted. Further references are to be found in the works cited. Becker, *Bild des Weges*, pp. 62-8; Bowra, *Pindar*, pp. 6-8, 122; Bundy, *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5, 1972, p. 90 n. 113; Coppola, *Introduzione*, p. 223; Donlan, *Aristocratic Ideal*, 95-111 (esp. 97-9); Gianotti, *Poetica Pindarica*, 95-109; B. Gladigow, *Sophia und Kosmos: Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte von cόφοc und cοφίη* (*Spudasmata* 1), Hildesheim 1965, 39-55; Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, 15-9, 54-7; W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, I, pp. 414/5; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, pp. 107-24; Van Leeuwen, *Tweede Olympische*, I pp. 232-54 (esp. 232-5); Norwood, *Pindar*, pp. 49-52, 224/5; O. Thimme, *ΦΥCΙC ΤΡΟΠΟC ΗΘΟC*, Diss. Göttingen 1935, 18 ff.; Thummer, *Religiosität*, pp. 65-90 (esp. 65-7).

40. cυγγενεῖ δέ τις εὐδοξίαι μέγα βρίθει

'One weighs much through the glory that goes with one's γένοc'. Inherited qualities (as opposed to διδακτά) are the qualities in a man that count. These give him the opportunity to accomplish great things, whereas a man who lacks these qualities, and only knows what he knows by learning, is inclined to be active on numerous

fields, without success. See preceding note. It may be surprising for a modern reader that here glory is said to be inherited and that inherited εὐδοξία is said to be the decisive factor for success. One would expect inherited qualities to be presented as such, εὐδοξία being the result that these inborn qualities are aiming at. However, a passage like this goes to show that in the archaic, aristocratic frame of reference quality and glory are closely correlated, so as virtually to be mutually exchangable. It is a well-known fact that in the archaic *Weltanschauung* there is not such a thing as a talent manqué or an unsung hero. A man's qualities are literally non-existent as long as they are not recognized by others.[165] Therefore ἀρετά ad δόξα are virtually one and the same thing. See also my note on ἀρετά, *N*.5.53 (pp. 188-90).

βρίθω, 'being heavy,' is already in Homer used metaphorically to express the idea that a man 'has the preponderance (in the fight),' that he 'outweighs' his opponents and 'prevails' over them.

Cf. ὃ γάρ κ' ὄχ' ἄριστον ἁπάντων | εἴη, ἐπεὶ τάχα τῇδε τετεύξεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος· | ὧδε γὰρ ἔβρισαν Λυκίων ἀγοί, οἵ τὸ πάρος περ | ζαχρηεῖς τελέθουσι κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας, *Il.*12.344-7; τῇδε γὰρ ἔβρισαν πόλεμον κάτα δακρυόεντα | Ἕκτωρ Αἰνείας θ', οἳ Τρώων εἰσὶν ἄριστοι, *Il.*17.512/3; cf. also *Il.*17.233; for the construction with a dative cf. κεῖνος δ' αὖ πέρι κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων, | ὅς κέ σ' ἐέδνοισι βρίσας οἶκόνδ' ἀγάγηται, *Od.*6.158/9; μηδ' ὄγκον ἄρῃ μηδέν' εἴ τινος πλέον | ἢ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει, S.*Aj.*129/30, where with the second alternative the literal meaning of the verb becomes relevant. Pindar uses the verb twice, apart from *h.l.* In χρυσοκάρποισιν βέβριθε ⟨δενδρέοις⟩[166], *fr.*129.5, it is used literally, with reference to the country of the blessed dead, being 'heavy from trees with golden fruit.' In ὅσπερ καὶ Κινύραν ἔβρισε πλούτωι, *N.*8.18, it is used transitively (cf. A.*Pers.*346). For the verb combined with **μέγα**, cf. ἐν δ' ἐτίθει σταφυλῇσι μέγα βρίθουσαν ἀλωὴν | καλὴν χρυσείην, *Il.*18.561/2.

For **εὐδοξία** cf. ὦ θεόμορ' Ἀρκεσίλα, | σύ τοί νιν (*sc.* πλοῦτον) κλυτᾶς | αἰῶνος ἀκρᾶν βαθμίδων ἄπο | σὺν εὐδοξίαι μετανίσεαι | ἕκατι χρυσαρμάτου Κάστορος, *P.*5.5-9; *Pae.*14.31. Cf. also the adjective εὔδοξος, qualifying the Games in *O.*14.23, *I.*1.1/2; B.9.21; qualifying the victory in *P.*6.16/7; qualifying the victor in *P.*12.5, *N.*7.8 (cf. also *I.*2.33/4, B.7.8/9, B.14.22); qualifying the victory celebration in *I.*8.1-4. Cf. also *fr.*172.6. For **συγγενής** cf. *N.*5.40/1, with my note (p. 168)

---

[165] This is what the whole *Iliad* is about, as many have demonstrated. The reason for Achilles to be not amused when Agamemnon took away Briseis is not that he loved her, but that she was a material representation of the Greeks' recognition of Achilles' qualities. Taking her away was the same as taking away this recognition and denying Achilles' qualities. Therefore Agamemnon's manœuvre was unacceptable to Achilles.

[166] Suppl. Wilamowitz.

41. ὃς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει

'Who has things learned,' i.e., 'who (merely) has διδακτά in his repertoire.' διδακτά in this connection refers to capacities that are 'learned' to the extent that they are alien to one's γένος or one's φυά. See above.

For **ἔχω** in the sense of 'having' knowledge cf. εἰ δὲ νόωι τις ἔχει θνατῶν ἀλαθείας ὁδόν, χρὴ πρὸς μακάρων | τυγχάνοντ' εὖ πασχέμεν, *P.*3.103/4; Οὐλυμπία, | δέσποιν' ἀλαθείας, ἵνα μάντιες ἄνδρες | ἐμπύροις τεκμαιρόμενοι παραπειρῶνται Διὸς ἀργικεραύνου, | εἴ τιν' ἔχει λόγον ἀνθρώπων πέρι | μαιομένων μεγάλαν | ἀρετὰν θυμῶι λαβεῖν, *O.*8.1-6; cf. also line 53 below.

41. ψεφηνὸς ἀνήρ

The adjective is a *hapax*. Ancient authorities all agree on it meaning 'dark.'

It is paraphrazed as σκοτεινός by the scholiast (71a, III 53) and in *EM* 818.33, both authorities explaining it as being derived from the noun ψέφος (ψεφενὸς καὶ ψεφηνὸς ἀνήρ· σκοτεινὸς, οὐκ ἐπιφανής· ψέφος γὰρ τὸ σκότος. φησὶ Πίνδαρος 'Αριστοκλεῖ, *EM loc. cit.*). The noun ψέφος, however, is nowhere attested in classical Greek, although it has been conjectured by Lobeck in Ael. Arist.45 (2.155 Dindorf), citing Alcaeus (437 L-P: εἰ δέ τινες καὶ ἄλλοι παραβοῶντες ῥητορικὴν ψέγουσι, μᾶλλον δὲ τονθορύζοντες, ἐκ τοῦ ψέφους[167] τοξεύοντες κατὰ 'Αλκαῖον, κτλ.). The noun is glossed καπνός by Hesychius. Apart from this, we have ψεφαρός, 'gloomy, cloudy' in Hp. ap. Gal.19.156 (glossed ψεφοειδής), and as a *varia lectio* for ὑποψεφαρός in Hp.*Prorrh.*1.116, and three more glosses in Hesychius (ψεφαίαις· σκοτειναῖς. ψεφαῖον· λυπρόν, σκοτεινόν. ψεφαυγοῦς· σκοτεινῆς).

Darkness is a symbol for a life without fame, either because successes deserving to be praised are lacking, as in τά κέ τις ἀνώνυμον | γῆρας ἐν σκότωι καθήμενος ἕψοι μάταν, | ἁπάντων καλῶν ἄμμορος, *O.*1.82-4, or because the successes are not illuminated by song, as in ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ | σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, *N.*7.12/3. Likewise, in *N.*7.61 ψόγος, 'fault-finding', as opposed to κλέος ἐτήτυμον (63), is metaphorically qualified as σκοτεινόν, since ψόγος results in the opposite of κλέος. The same idea occurs in ἔμπα, καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιὰς ἅλμα | μέσσον, ἀντίτειν' ἐπιβουλίαις· σφόδρα δόξομεν | δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν· | φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων | γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότωι κυλίνδει | χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν, *N.*4.36-41. Cf. also *fr.*42, 228. In the same fashion, light may be a symbol for fame, as in line 64 and in the last line of this ode. See my note on line 64 below (pp. 370-2).

---

[167] "Pro ψόφου σκότου cod. E. ψέφους corr. Lobeck, probabilissime, sed fort. etiam ζόφου (Jacobs) possis. cf. Sophron. ap. Ap. Dysc. π. ἀντ. 122 c (i 96 Schn.) ὁ δ' ἐκ τῶ σκότεος τοξεύων αἰὲν ἕνα τινὰ ὧν ζυγαστροφεῖ. alio sensu ἐν σκότωι τοξεύοντες Ael. Arist. xxxvi 100 (ii 295 Keil)" Lobel-Page.

In this particular context the adjective has double relevance. A man who has merely διδακτά is 'a man in the dark' because the light of fame is not shining upon him, so that he is not seen, and because he cannot find his way, as the following lines demonstrate.

As for the orthography of the adjective, all mss., as well as the scholion, read ψεφηνόϲ. The passage quoted above from the *Etymologicum Magnum*, however, gives rise to the suspicion, that its author was familiar with a *varia lectio* ψεφενόϲ. This form is unmetrical, but it has led R. Porson (*Adversaria*, Cambridge 1812, 312) to conjecture ψεφεννόϲ, which is adopted in the texts of Snell-Maehler and Bowra. Bergk conjectured ψεφεινόϲ. Although such a matter is fairly arbitrary with a *hapax*, I think the general acception of Porson's ψεφεννόϲ may be challenged from a methodical point of view. Because of *EM* 818.33 we have two variants, ψεφηνόϲ and ψεφενόϲ, of which the former has the authority of the Pindar mss., and the latter is unmetrical. Moreover, since Pindar himself could not make the difference in writing, both variants only go to prove that the authograph read ΦϹΕΦΕΝΟϹ, which has to be interpreted as φcĕφēνοc because of the metre, which, in turn, is spelled either ψεφηνόϲ or ψεφεινόϲ according to our modern conventions. The former has the attractivity of unanimous manuscriptual tradition. Linguistically, however, the form ψεφηνόϲ is unparalleled. The idea would be that it would be derived from ψέφοϲ: ψέφεϲ-νο-, and -es-no- would result in -εινοϲ in Ion./Att., -εννοϲ in Aeol., and -ηνοϲ in the other dialects (cf. e.g. Cret. ἠμί for εἰμί). But the ending -ηνοϲ does not occur (cf. Chantraine, *Formation des noms*, pp. 195/6, 206). One could assume that the epic endings -εινοϲ/-εννοϲ have systematically replaced -ηνοϲ, *h.l.* being the only trace of the non-homeric ending, which is, of course, as dangerous an assumption as it is interesting. Another possibility would be that the adjective was derived from ψέφαϲ-νο-, which would give -ᾱνοϲ, and in Ion./Att. -ηνοϲ. One would, however, not expect Pindar to use the typically Ion./Att. ending; on the other hand, Pindar's dialect is a hybrid.

41. ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων

'Always breathing forth a different spirit,' i.e., 'with varying ambitions and states of mind.' Cf. ἀναπνέομεν δ' οὐχ ἅπαντεϲ ἐπὶ ἶϲα, *N.*7.5. A man who does not follow his φυά, or his ϲυγγενὴϲ εὐδοξία, has no guidance whatsoever to go by and may feel tempted to vainly try his luck in numerous trade. He does not have one ambition, the one that is in accordance with the qualities immanent to his φυά, but he is at loss, having always different ambitions.

The verb **πνέω**, 'to breathe,' is used in Homer with the direct object μένεα in the fixed epithet μένεα πνείοντεϲ, 'breathing spirit, breathing forth pugnacity' (*Il.*2.536, 3.8, 11.508, etc.). Homer himself probably percieved μένοϲ as a physical entity, which could actually manifest itself in breathing, so that the verb in this expression is not used metaphorically according to his frame of reference. Later

poets, who did no longer percieve μένος as a physical entity, but rather as a state of mind, took the Homeric formula as the archetype of a metaphorical usage of πνέω, and imitated the Homeric expression by using the verb with similar direct objects referring to other states of mind.

Cf. κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται. | ἴσχει τε γὰρ ὄλβος οὐ μείονα φθόνον· | ὁ δὲ χαμηλὰ πνέων ἄφαντον βρέμει, *P.*11.30, cf. πνέοντες μεγάλα, E.*Andr.*189; καὶ ὅταν καλὰ {μὲν} ἔρξαις ἀοιδᾶς ἄτερ, | Ἁγησίδαμ', εἰς Ἀΐδα σταθμὸν | ἀνὴρ ἵκηται, κενεὰ πνεύσαις ἔπορε μόχθωι βραχύ τι τερπνόν, *O.*10.91-3; τορὸς γὰρ ὀρθόθριξ δόμων | ὀνειρόμαντις ἐξ ὕπνου κότον πνέων | ἀωρόνυκτον ἀμβόαμα μυχόθεν ἔλακε περὶ φοβῶι, A.*Ch.*32-5; ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκας ἔδυ λέπαδνον | φρενὸς πνέων δυσσεβῆ τροπαίαν | ἄναγνον ἀνίερον, A.*Ag.*218-20; ἀλλ' ἦν παλαιστὴς κάρτ' ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν, A.*Ag.*1206, etc.

For the figure **ἄλλοτε ἄλλος** cf. *O.*7.94/5, *P.*3.104-5, *I.*4.5/6. See also Jutta Krause, Ἄλλοτε ἄλλος: *Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schichsalswechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides*, München 1976, 91-138. For its use in 'summary priamels' see my note on line 6 above (p. 253).

41-42. οὔ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ | κατέβα ποδί

A man who merely has διδακτά 'does[168] not ever step down with sure foot.' The qualification ἀτρεκεῖ ... ποδί guides the hearer to take **κατέβα** in the first place literal: 'never walks steadily.' However, agonistic connotations (see my note on *P.*8.78, pp. 654-9) give the verb a far deeper significance. Thus, the relevance of the gnomic passage in 40-2 to the victor is stressed, because "the description of the failure in 41 ff. contains two expressions which suggest athletics, an indication that this man is meant to contrast the endurance of Aristoclides. καταβαίνω can mean 'enter the list.' ἀτρεκεῖ ποδί suggests the ability of the wrestler or pancratiast to trip his opponent without himself being tripped" (Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158). On the verbal repetition, see next note.

The *junctura* of **ἀτρεκής**, meaning 'precise, exact,' with πούς is striking.[169] One may compare ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα in *N.*1.25 in a similar generic context, cited above. It is instructive to compare also:

---

[168] The aorist is gnomic. "The fact that a thing repeatedly, or always, or never was so in the past, may be taken to imply that it repeatedly, or always, or never, *is* so in general; this implication may suggest itself to the hearer, and thus lead to the intended interpretation of the statement, independent of any explicit signs like πολλάκις and οὔπω", Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 36. Here οὔ ποτ' is such an explicit signal.

[169] The adjective usually qualifies abstact notions, that can be counted or otherwise checked for their exactness, like καιρός (*P.*8.7), or ἀριθμός (Hdt.7.187), or δίαιτα (Hp.*Mochl.*42). In οὔ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων | φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκές, *N.*5.16/7, the adjective does, admittedly, qualify a part of the body, but it is the face of the personified ἀλάθεια. See my note. The *varia lectio* ἀτρεμεῖ in D is clearly *facilior.*

ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι, πατρίαν | εἴπερ καθ' ὁδὸν νιν εὐθυπομπὸς | αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις δέδωκε κόσμον Ἀθάναις, | θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυθίοισί τε νικᾶν | Τιμονόου παῖδ', *N.*2.6-10. The poet gives voice to his high hopes for a successful future of the victor, which is based on the achievements of the victor's father, and confirmed by the first victory of his own, which is, therefore, presented as a prelude to further victories. These are warranted (ὀφείλει, 6) if his αἰών, 'his lifetime,' 'sends him forth, straight (εὐθύπομπος) along the road of his father(s).' The presentation of successes on the part of the father as a reason to expect successes on the part of the son may be compared to the gnomic συγγενεῖ δέ τις εὐδοξίαι μέγα βρίθει in line 40. Notice also that the αἰών is qualified as εὐθύπομπος. The desirable confinement to 'the road of his father(s),' as expressed by means of εὐθύ-, may be compared to ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα in *N.*1.25, and contrasted to οὔ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ | κατέβα ποδί *h.l.* [170]

42. μυριᾶν δ' ἀρετᾶν ἀτελεῖ νόωι γεύεται

'He has (merely) a taste of numerous ἀρεταί, numerous ways to distinguish himself, with an ineffectual mind.' **γεύομαι**, 'tasting,' is always used metaphorically by Pindar, i.e., with genitive-adjuncts not referring to food or drink. In the majority of cases the *ground* of the metaphor is the enjoyment the subject experiences from the tasting, the *suppressed tenor* being 'to taste the sweets of, to enjoy'.

As in: γεύεται δ' ἀλκᾶς ἀπειράντου, *P.*9.35, 'she tastes the sweets of valour without bounds'; Ἱπποκλέαι θέλοντες | ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα | γεύεται γὰρ ἀέθλων, *P.*10.5-7; εἰ δὲ γεύεται | ἀνδρὸς ἀνήρ τι, *N.*7.87/8; ἔν τ' ἀέθλοισι θίγον πλείστων ἀγώνων, | καὶ τριπόδεσσιν ἐκόσμησαν δόμον | καὶ λεβήτεσσι φιάλαισί τε χρυσοῦ, | γευόμενοι στεφάνων, *I.*1.18-21; cf. also ἐλευθερίης γευσάμενοι, Hdt.6.5, etc.

The verb may be used with genitive-adjuncts referring to unpleasant notions. In these cases the *ground* of the metaphor is simply that someone who tastes something in a way experiences it, the *suppressed tenor* being 'to experience, to feel.'

As in: ἐπεὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἀεθλοφόροι πρὸς ἄκρον ἀρετᾶς | ἦλθον, οἵ τε πόνων ἐγεύσαντο, *N.*6.23/4; cf. also S.*Tr.*1101, E.*Alc.*1069. In Homer this metaphorical usage is found with genitive-adjuncts referring to arms: ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ δουρὸς ἀκωκῆς ἡμετέροιο | γεύσεται, *Il.*21.60/1; ἦ τοι ὀϊστοῦ γε πρῶτος γεύσεσθαι ἔμελλεν | ἐκ χείρων Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ὃν τότ' ἀτίμα ἥμενον ἐν μεγάροις, ἐπὶ δ' ὤρνυε πάντας ἑταίρους, *Od.*21.98-100, etc. The use of γεύομαι in these cases is ironical.

---

[170] For the opposition εὐθύς—σκολιός see also: Becker, *Bild des Weges*, 85-100 (esp. 89-93); H. Fränkel, *Gnomon* 6, 1930, 10; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 98-100; Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, 326 n. 1.

Here the *ground* of the metaphor is determined by the fact that someone who has a taste of something tries out whether the food is to his liking, the *supressed tenor* being some verb referring to the act of 'trying out, testing.'

As in: ἀλλ' ἄγε θᾶccov | γευcόμεθ' ἀλλήλων χελκήρεcιν ἐγχείηιcιν, *Il.*20.257/8, 'let us try one another with the spear'; εὐθὺc δὲ δείcαc ἐμπύρων ἐγευόμην, S.*Ant.*1005, 'I tried (the method of divining by) burnt-offerings.' This may possibly also be the way in which the verb is used in: τὸ δ' ἐμόν, | οὔκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν, κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται, *I.*5.19/20, 'I do not try to make a song in which no Aeacid occurs'; this instance may, however, also be classified in the first category: 'I do not enjoy songs in which no Aeacid occurs.'

It is relevant for the *ground* of the metaphor *h.l.* that someone who tastes something only consuming small quantities of it, not finishing his plate. The fact that γεύομαι evokes associations of 'taking only small bites, of various dishes' may be the *target* of this metaphor, especially with μυριᾶν, suggesting the endlessness of the series.

The adjective **ἀτελήc** denotes that the notion qualified by it is 'ineffectual,' that it does not bring (the desired) τέλοc.

Cf. ὁ δ' ἀρχαγέταc ἔδωκ' Ἀπόλλων | θῆραc αἰνῶι φόβωι, | ὄφρα μὴ ταμίαι Κυράναc ἀτελὴc γένοιτο μαντεύμαcιν, *P.*5.60-2, 'in order not to appear to be ineffectual as to his oracles', i.e. someone who does not accomplish the τέλοc, the fulfillment, of his oracles; ⟨τοὺc φυcιολογοῦνταc⟩ ἀτελῆ cοφίαc καρπὸν δρέπ(ειν), *fr.*209, 'reap those fruits of wisdom that bring nothing.'

The verbal repetition of κατέβαινε in line 25 is functional, especially since ἀτελεῖ νόωι (42) seems to pick up and contrast the hero's sucessful τέλοc (25). Thus, by means of the verbal repetition Heracles is in retrospect characterized as a hero who cυγγενεῖ εὐδοξίαι μέγα βρίθει (40).[171] See further interpretation, p. 226. For **ἀρεταί**, see my note on *N.*5.53, pp. 188-90.

[171] See also Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 24/5. However, I do not agree with Kurke, who, following Steiner, *Crown of Song*, p. 69, submits that "the participle πνέων also contributes to the seafaring imagery, evoking the inconstant, shifting winds that keep the sailor from his goal" (p. 25). The fact that the ψεφηνὸc ἀνήρ himself is the subject of πνέων excludes this possibility. See preceding note.

STROPHE Γ

43-49

Fair Achilleus, at first staying at the home of Philyra, as a child, played great deeds: Throwing his short spear with an iron point with his hands, many times and with the speed of the winds, he dealt death in battle to wild lions, and he slew boars. Their panting bodies he brought to the centaur, Cronus' son, first when he was six years old, then whole the time.

43-52 Achilles' childhood. Mythological background

According to Homer, Achilles learned only his medical skills from Chiron (*Il.*11.830-2, with Σ.*ad loc.*; cf. Σ.*ad h.l.* line 43, 76b, III 54 Dr.). Xenophon, in his *Cynegetica* (1.2), lists Achilles as the last of the twenty-one heroes who were Chiron's μαθηταὶ κυνηγεςίων τε καὶ ἑτέρων καλῶν.[172] Nowhere, except for *h.l.*, Achilles is said to have killed lions or boars when he was six years old, but some later sources record that Achilles as a boy was fed on the inwards of lions and wild swine and the marrows of bears (Apollod.3.13.6, Stat.*Ach.*2.384, cf. Philostr.*Her.*197 K., *E.M.* p. 181). His exceptional running speed is proverbial ever since the Homeric ποδὰς ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς. The story of Achilles outrunning deer, however, is almost certainly a Pindaric invention, or, to put it more accurately, a newly invented combination of traditional features of the Achilles-myth (see also below, my note on 52/3). Euripides (*IA* 206-15) tells that Achilles won a running contest against four-in-hand. Cf. further *P.*6.19-23, E.*IA* 926/7, Paus.3.18.2, A.R.4.813 with Σ., Stat. *Ach.*1.166/7, 2.381/2, Σ. *ad* Arat.436, Plut. *Quaest.Conv.*5.2, Σ. *ad* D.18.72, etc.

43. ξανθός

In Greece fairness is something special. In Pindar the priviledge of being blond is reserved for Achilles (*h.l.*; cf. *Il.*1.197, 23.141), Menelaus (*N.*7.28; cf. *Il.*2.642, etc.), Athena (*N.*10.7, *fr.*34), and the Graces (*N.*5.54). Köhnken (*Funktion des Mythos*, on *N.*7.28) suggested that the adjective evokes connotations of 'unmanliness.' This is highly unlikely in the light of the Homeric parallels; moreover, this line introduces an account of Achilles accomplishing truly great and manly deeds, notwithstanding his age. The qualification associates

---

[172] On Chiron as educator in general, see also West *ad* Hes.*Th.*1001; Vian *ad* A.R.1.558 (p. 254); Livrea *ad* A.R.4.813; H. van Wees, 'Growing up in Early Greece: Heroic and Aristocratic Educations,' *Education in Greek Fiction* (A.H. Sommerstein & C. Atherton, edd.), Bari 1996. See also my notes on lines 53 and 54 below.

Achilles with physical attractiveness, which parallels the reference to the victor's beauty in line 19 above, and thus helps to associate the victor with the great hero.

43. δ'

After Peleus (32-6) and Telamon (36-9), and after the gnomic interruption (40-2), the poet proceeds to relate his story about the second generation of the Aeacids, Achilles. He is the *topic* of the following passage (43-52) and is introduced as such, the adjective ξανθός qualifying him having been placed in the marked position directly before δ'. This procedure ignores the gnomic interruption, to the extent that Achilles stands as a *topic* on the same level as Peleus and Telamon in the passages preceding the gnomes. In other words, the logical relation between the gnomic passage and what precedes it, as well as between the gnomes and the subsequent passage is left to the interpretation of the audience. In both cases the only linguistic signal that might guide the audience in this is δέ (40, *h.l.*). See introduction, pp. 26-30.

43. τὰ μέν

τὰ μέν is a fossilized adverbial expression, meaning 'at one time, on the one hand,' which may be balanced by τὰ δέ, 'then again, on the other hand.'

> Cf. νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράσος | δεινῶν πολέμων· ὅθεν φαμὶ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, | τὰ μὲν ἐν ἱπποσόαισιν ἄνδρεσσι μαρνάμενον, τὰ δ' ἐν πεζομάχαισι, *P.*2.63-5. Cf. further *O.*9.89-96, *I.*3.11-3, *O.*13.52-7, *P.*8.28 with my note (pp. 507/8). In τὰ μὲν ⟨ἐν⟩ ἅρμασι καλλίνικοι πάλαι | Ὀλυμπίαι τ' ἀγώνων πολυφάτων | ἔσχον θοὰν ἀκτῖνα σὺν ἵπποις, | Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεγξαν | Ἑλλανίδα στρατιὰν ὠκύτατι, *P.*11.46-50, the corresponding notions are the victories in the chariot race and those in the foot race respectively. The constuction is, however, asymmetric. Instead of 'on the one hand, in the chariot race, they won at Olympia, on the other, in the foot race, they won at Delphi' the formulation is 'on the one hand, in the chariot race—they won both at Olympia with their horses and at Delphi in the foot race.'

Here a corresponding τὰ δέ phrase is absent. τὰ μέν introduces the temporal specification μένων Φιλύρας ἐν δόμοις, | παῖς ἐών, 'at first, in Philyra's home, when he was a child.' This temporal reference is restated in line 49 as ἑξέτης τὸ πρῶτον, which is balanced by ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον. Achilles did not literaly continue to kill animals and bring the sports to Chiron, but he did continue to do the same approximately, namely to display the same qualities. Thus τὰ μέν helps to present the miraculous exploits of the boy Achilles as prefiguring his more known accomplishments at Troy. See further my note on line 49 below (pp. 346/7) and interpretation, pp. 211-3.

Since Achilles' deeds before Troy are alluded to below in lines 59-63, this interpretation comes close to the interpretation of Dissen (II, 2, pp. 372/3), Fennell (p. 26), and Farnell (pp. 258/9), that the antithesis is with the grown-up Achilles in those lines. However—apart from the fact that we are not dealing with an *antithesis* here—, it must be observed that lines 59-63 do not correspond to τὰ μέν in a formal, syntactic way. Pindar's audience, perceiving the text linearly, would not save up μέν for sixteen lines, in which δέ occurs four times, nor would they recognize line 59, in which δέ does not occur, as balancing it. My interpretation also comes close to the interpretation taking τὰ μὲν to be balanced by δ' ἔπειτα in line 49, as it has been proposed by Mezger (p. 388) and Bury (p. 54). But, again, since δ' ἔπειτα balances τὸ πρῶτον in the same line, it does not balance τὰ μὲν in a formal way other than that it balances a notion that *resumes* τὰ μέν. Erbse (*Hermes* 97, 1969, 283 ff.) suggested that τὰ μὲν is balanced by δέ in line 52; but there are two δέ's between line 43 and 52 which would confuse the syntactic connection. The same objection must be raised against Instone, *Selected Odes*, p. 162, who suggested that τὰ μέν is balanced by δ' αὖτιϲ in 56. Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 43 n. 94, argues that it corresponds with δέ in line 47: "The contrast is between rest at Philyra's cave (when he shoots the animals) and the movement which is necessary to retrieve their bodies. Rest is correlated with Philyra and feminity (μέν), movement with Cheiron and masculinity (δέ)." This analysis is based on a false interpretation of μένων (see below, next note). δέ in line 47 simply introduces the next step in the narrative, bringing home the animals after having killed them, without any antithesis being implied.

43. μένων Φιλύραϲ ἐν δόμοιϲ

'Staying at the home of Philyra,' i.e., 'during his stay with Chiron.' This gives the local setting of the story, as well as the temporal orientation, for Pindar's audience would associate Chiron's cave with Achilles' childhood (cf. next note). The reference to Chiron's *mother*[173] is functional. The associations evoked by referring to a mother-figure suggest that Achilles was still so young as to need maternal care and arrestingly contrast Achilles' dangerous child-games.[174]

μένω is baffling. LSJ cite three examples of the verb in the sense 'to stay, lodge', which would be appropriate here, but in these cases the

---

[173] Cf. *P.*6.22, *P.*4.102/3, *P.*3.1, *P.*9.29/30, B.27.34, Hes.*Th.*1002, with West *ad loc.* Cf. also Σ.*ad h.l.* For the story that Cronus copulated with Philyra in the shape of a horse, cf. A.R.2.1231-41 with Σ.*ad loc.* (=Pherecydes, *FGrHist* 3 F 50) and Vian *ad loc.* (p. 284), Σ.*ad* A.R.1.554 (=*Titanomach. fr.*7 Kinkel), Servius on Verg.*G.*3.93, Hyg.*Fab.*138. See also Stoll in Roscher, *Lexicon, s.v.* Philyra, 1.

[174] Cf. τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰῶνα, *P.*4.186 (cf. Hes.*Op.*130/1, 520); οὐδὲ μολόντων παρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλωϲ γλυκὺϲ | ὦρϲεν χάριν, *P.*8.85/6; ὡϲ δ' ἄφαντοϲ ἔπελεϲ, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτεϲ ἄγαγον, *O.*1.46. Cf. also *N.*5.6 with my note (p. 106).

choice of the verb is motivated by the fact that a contrast with others leaving, or having left, is implied.[175] Nothing in the context here points at such an implied contrast.[176] However, the verb has the connotation 'to wait', viz. for something else to come. This connotation is evoked by τὰ μέν, directing the audience's minds towards the great deeds Achilles accomplished later, in his manhood, before Troy (see preceding note). So: 'at first, staying at the home of Philyra and waiting (for himself to grow up in order to fulfill his destiny and sail to Troy), when he was still a child'. With this interpretation the verb helps to present the great deeds Achilles accomplished in his childhood as prefiguring his famous exploits before Troy. This is in keeping with the whole drift of the main narrative, which aims at paralleling the two periods, Achilles' youth and manhood.[177]

44. παῖc ἐών

This gives, more specifically, the temporal setting of the story (cf. preceding note). More importantly, the phrase gives a detail which is significant in the light of what immediately follows, thus highlighting the amazing fact that Achilles, though merely a child, accomplished great deeds. The phrase can also be said to explain the choice of the verb ἄθυρε.

44. ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα

'He played great deeds,' i.e., his child's game consisted of accomplishing great deeds. A similar *oxymoron* occurs in: παῖδα δ' ἔμμεν πρώθηβον, ἀρηΐων δ' ἀθυρμάτων | μεμνᾶcθαι πολέμου τε καὶ χαλκεοκτύπου μάχαc, B.18.56-9 (of Theseus). The following lines (44-9) specify what these μεγάλα ἔργα consisted of (see also next note).

---

[175] In τὸν δὲ παμπειθῆ γλυκὺν ἡμιθέοιcιν πόθον ἔνδαιεν Ἥρα | ναὸc Ἀργοῦc, μή τινα λειπόμενον | τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰῶνα πέccοντ', *P.*4.184-6, there is a contrast between sailing away on the Argo and staying home. In οἰκήcειc δὲ τὴν ἐμὴν οἰκίην ὑπερευκαιρέουcαν, ἅτε καὶ τοῦ γυναίου μένοντοc πρὸc τοὺc γονέαc διὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐκδημίην, Hp.*Ep.*13, the contrast is implied by τὴν ἐμὴν ἐκδημίην. Similarly: ὁ δ' Ἀcτυμήδηc αὐτῶι μὲν ἐδόκει καλῶc εἰρηκέναι περὶ τῆc πατρίδοc, οὐ μὴν τοῖc γε παρεπιδημοῦcιν οὐδὲ τοῖc οἴκοι μένουcιν τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐδαμῶc ἤρκεcεν, Plb.30.4.10. The verb may be rendered 'stay behind' in these cases.

[176] The interpretation of the verb alone implying such a contrast, Achilles one day 'staying behind' all alone in the cave, while Chiron, who doubtlessly had much business to attend to, went out, is too fanciful surely.

[177] μένων does not denote that Achilles shot the beasts without leaving the cave, as it is taken by Mezger (*ad loc.*), Bury (*ad loc.*, p. 54) and Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 43, who speaks of "Achilles' static and restricted domain as a child", rendering 'remaining at the home of Philyra' (cf. also *ibid.* n. 94, quoted above). First, cώματα δὲ παρὰ ... | Κένταυρον ... κόμιζεν (47/8) only is relevant if there is some distance between the place of the killing and Chiron's cave. Second, ποccὶ γὰρ κράτεcκε in line 52 unambiguously refers to a pursuit, at least in the case of deer. See also Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 259).

Like the English verb 'playing', **ἀθύρειν** may be used to refer to playing both as a typical children's activity and as a musical activity. For the verb with a direct object, cf. δονάκων ὕπο μοῦςαν ἀθύρων | νήδυμον, *h.Pan.*15/6; ςπάργανον ἀμφ' ὤμοις εἰλυμένος ἠΰτε τέκνον | νήπιον ἐν παλάμηιςι περ' ἰγνύςι λαῖφος ἀθύρων | κεῖτο, *h.Merc.*152, 'playing with the bedding'; ἔργα φωτῶν ἀθύρειν, *AP* 9.505.8, 'play the deeds of men', of the comic Muse. Cf. also ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὃς αὐτοῦ | πᾶςαν ὀρθώςαις ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφραςεν | θεςπεςίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν, *I.*4.37-9, 'playing' as a musical activity; ὡς ὅτε τις ψάμαθον πάϊς ἄγχι θαλάςςης, | ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ποιήςηι ἀθύρματα νηπιέηιςιν | ἂψ αὖτις ςυνέχευε ποςὶν καὶ χερςὶν ἀθύρων, *Il.*15-362-4; νέος μὲν οὖν ὢν ἀμφὶ βωμίους τροφὰς ἠλᾶτ' ἀθύρων, E.*Ion.*52/3, etc. For the noun, cf. δέδεξαι τόνδε κῶμον ἀνέρων, | Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα, *P.*5.22/3; τὴν Δολίος μὲν ἔτικτε, κόμιςςε δὲ Πηνελόπεια, | παῖδα δὲ ὣς ἀτίταλλε, δίδου δ' ἄρ' ἀθύρματα θυμῶι, *Od.*18.322/3; ἐρατεινὸν ἄθυρμα, *h.Merc.*40, of the lyre, being young Hermes' toy, cf. also *ibid.* 32, 52; τίς δ' οὐχὶ χαίρει νηπίοις ἀθύρμαςιν; E.*fr.*272 N., etc.

44-49. Structure: Coordination and Punctuation

There is no explicit signal for a new sentence beginning after ἔργα. A listening audience, perceiving lines 44-9 in a linear way, is confronted with the following situation. After ἔργα the sentence could be complete; after χερςί the sentence could be theoretically complete once again, and so could it after θαμινά (though this would be a rather awkward sentence for word-order); the accusative phrase βραχυςίδαρον ἄκοντα falls in place with πάλλων, and it is only at this point that the hearer is in a position to understand that χερςὶ θαμινά is probably part of the participle phrase ruled by πάλλων. But still no particle has intervened, to the effect that at this point the most natural way of interpreting is to take the participle phrase as a whole to qualify the *preceding* main clause (ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα). With ἴςα τ' ἀνέμοις (45) the situation becomes more complex, for the particle τ' can either coordinate ἴςα ἀνέμοις with θαμινά, or signal the beginning of a new sentence. It is only when he hears ἔπραςςεν that the hearer knows for sure that a new sentence has indeed begun somewhere after ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα, and he will be inclined in the first place to take τ' in 45 to have signalled its beginning. It is only because 'like the winds' hardly makes sense when operating under the scope of ἔπραςςεν ('He played great deeds swaying his his spear; and like the winds he killed lions') that he will adopt the option of τ' coordinating both adverbial phrases under the scope of πάλλων. Yet, there is no explicit signal whatsoever that determines whether the participle phrase gouverned by πάλλων as a whole qualifies ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα or ἔπραςςεν φόνον (in other words, whether the new main sentence begins with χερςί or with μάχαι). Again he has only

sense to go by: 'swaying his spear' is perfectly understandible as qualifying the killing of beasts following it, which would result in 'he played great deeds' being the 'abstract' introducing the more detailed narrative, whereas 'he played great deeds swaying his spear: he killed lions and boars' is slightly less convenient, though by no means impossible. The latter option, however, becomes less likely as the narrative proceeds. After the reference to Achilles killing beasts a statement follows explaining what he did with them after he had killed them (47/8). This statement is connected to the preceding one by means of δέ (47), characterizing it as an independent step in the narrative.[178] Taking the phrase χερcί ... πάλλων ἴca τ' ἀνέμοιc to qualify ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα makes it difficult to include cώματα δὲ ... κόμιζεν as one of the 'great deeds' Achilles played as a child. Line 49 adds a temporal specification to the entire complex: He started doing so (killing beasts and bringing them to Chiron) when he was six years old and he continued doing so the rest of his life. Achilles did not literally continue to kill animals and bring the sports to Chiron, but he did continue to do the same approximately, namely to display the same qualities, as lines 59-63 will testify. ἑξέτηc τὸ πρῶτον resumes the temporal specification τὰ μέν μένων Φιλύραc ἐν δόμοιc, | παῖc ἐών (43/4). As ἑξέτηc τὸ πρῶτον is balanced by ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον, the second member of line 49 represents the corresponding τὰ δέ phrase.

Thus it is only with line 49 that the structure of the entire passage (43-9) becomes clear. Not only because line 49 provides the notion corresponding to τὰ μέν in 43, but also because it makes clear that cώματα ... κόμιζεν (47/8) falls under the scope of παῖc ἐὼν ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα, which, in turn, strongly pleads in favour of taking the participle phrase ruled by πάλλων (44/5) to qualify the following statements about the killing of beasts. The conclusion must be that most editors' interpunction, a point above the line after ἔργα and a comma after ἀνέμοιc, mirrors the most satisfactory interpretation of these lines. Yet, a hearer, perceiving these lines in a linear way, is only when he hears line 49 in a position to, retrospectively, arrive at this interpretation.

With this punctuation, the new sentence beginning with χερcί, we have asyndeton. This asyndeton is not very difficult to account for. The statement παῖc ἐὼν ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα (44) is a general statement demanding specification. In the subsequent lines (44-9) this specification is given and it is related of which these μεγάλα ἔργα exactly

---

178 Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 15-7.

consisted. "Narrators often begin by establishing the point of a story or by giving the most salient events in a nutshell", Fleischman, *Tense and Narrativity*, p. 137, who uses the term 'abstract' for such introductions of stories. Thus ... παῖς ἐὼν ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα (43/4) in a way announces the sequel. In line 44, then, the narration proper begins. The absence of a particle at the beginning of this section may be compared to the regular absense of one at the beginning of narrations as a whole. See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 372, and especially Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 40-4.

One could imagine a prose writer to have used γάρ. It will be clear that a connection with δέ is excluded, since this would mark the sentence as an independent step in the narrative, in succession of παῖς ἐὼν ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα, instead of as an elaboration of it. Connection with καί or τε would perhaps have been possible; in this case the sentence would have to be interpreted as an "expansion and amplification of the thesis which the preceding sentence ended"[179], or as an alternative—and, as often, more specific—expression with the same referent as that which precedes.

In sum, the linguistic structure of the specification (44-9) is as follows: After a preposed participle phrase adding detail (44/5)[180], we have two statements: Achilles killed lions (46) and he killed boars (47). Both events are related in a main clause, connected with τ' (47). This indicates that both statements belong together, having the same referent (i.e. the killing of beasts), and that both events form one step in the narrative. The preposed participle phrase (44/5) qualifies both events. After the reference to Achilles killing beasts a statement follows explaining what he did with them after he had killed them (47/8). This statement is connected to the preceding one by means of δέ (47), characterizing it as an independent step in the narrative[181]. Line 49 adds a temporal specification to the entire complex. ἑξέτης τὸ πρῶτον resumes the temporal specification τὰ μὲν μένων Φιλύρας ἐν δόμοις, | παῖς ἐὼν (43/4). As ἑξέτης τὸ πρῶτον is balanced by ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον, the second member of line 49 represents the corresponding τὰ δέ phrase.

44-45. χερσὶ θαμινὰ | βραχυσίδαρον ἄκοντα πάλλων ἴσα τ' ἀνέμοις 'Throwing with his hands his short spear with an iron point, frequently and equal to the winds.' The phrase qualifies both actions referred to in 46/7.

---

179 Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 14.

180 The particle τ' in 45 places the adverbial phrase ἴσα ἀνέμοις (45) on a par with θαμινά (44).

181 For an illuminating account of the distribution of δέ and καί in narratives, see Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 15-7.

• *Text:* The mss.-reading ἶςόν τ' ἀνέμοιςιν does not scan, ⏑⏑⏑⏑— being required. The ending of the noun may be a hypercorrection for ἀνέμοις. The short syllable is restored by most editors by adopting Moschopulos' ἴςα τ' ἀνέμοις. Moscholpulos' conjecture presupposes that the plural accusative was, at one point, not recognized as an adverbial adjunct[182] and that a scribe restored the syntax by making it congruent with ἄκοντα.[183]

βραχυςίδαρος serves to associate Achilles' spear with the notions βραχύς and ςιδαρός: 'short and with an iron point.' A boy uses small weapons.[184] The qualification adds realistic detail, once more emphasizing that Achilles was merely a child. The adjective is a *hapax*. The verb **πάλλων** is used metaphorically. Since the mere 'swaying' of a missile is hardly lethal, and since ἴςα τ' ἀνέμοις makes more sense as a qualification of the flight of the spear than of the speed with which it was shaken, the verb must be used in the sense of 'throwing.'[185] The act of throwing the spear is qualified as **ἴςα ἀνέμοις**, 'equal to the winds,' the *ground* being that both the spear and winds travel through the air and that both do so at great speed.[186] Due to its emphatic placement in the first position of the sentence and its seeming redundancy, **χερςί** is eye-catching. First, the emphasis on Achilles' manual qualities is complemented by a reference to the excellence of his feet in line 52; the two together illustrate the completeness of his physical superiority; moreover, strong hands and swift feet are essential for a warrior[187] as well as for

[182] For the plural accusative marking an adjective as an adverb, cf., e.g., βάρυνθεν δὲ περιςςὰ Δελφοὶ ξεναγέται, *N.*7.43, and θαμινά here.

[183] An alternative solution is to delete τ', following Schroeder. This presupposes that a scribe, being mislead, perhaps, by the asyndeton in line 44 and having missed the stop after μεγάλα ἔργα, took ἴςον ἀνέμοις as an adverbial adjunct to ἔπραςςεν in line 46 and inserted τ' in order to avoid asyndeton. This scenario is, however, unlikely. If the original reading would have been ἴςον ἀνέμοις, a scribe would naturally take it as an attributive adjunct to ἄκοντα, so, if he would have felt the need for the insertion of a particle, he would rather have interted δέ (more likely than τε) after μάχαι.

[184] Thus also Σ.*ad loc.* (ἐπεὶ παῖς ἦν ὁ 'Αχιλλεύς, ἀνάλογον εἶχε τῆι ἡλικίαι βραχυςίδαρον ἄκοντα, τουτέςτι παιδικῶι δόρατι ἐχρήςατο, 79, III 54 Dr.). The scholiast's alternative explanition (ἤτοι καθὸ βραχυςίδαρός ἐςτιν ἡ ἀκμὴ πρὸς τὸ ξύλον τοῦ δόρατος ςυγκρινομένη, *ibid.*) is by far less relevant in the context.

[185] The meaning of active, transitive πάλλω is 'to shake, toss' (cf. κλήρους ἐν κυνέηι χαλκήρεϊ πάλλον, *Il.*3.316; πέλτας θ' ὅςοι πάλλουςι, E.*Ba.*783; [Hes.]*Sc.*321). It is often used to refer to the swaying of a missile before it is thrown (αἰχμῆς ..., ἣν ἄρ' 'Αχιλλεὺς | πάλλεν δεξιτερῆι φρονέων κακὸν Ἕκτορι δίωι, | εἰςορόων χρόα καλόν, ὅπηι εἴξειε μάλιςτα, *Il.*22.319-21; cf. 3.19, 5.304, 16.142, etc.). See further my note on *N.*5.21, pp. 133-4.

[186] The adjective ἰςάνεμος occurs in τὸν ἰςάνεμόν τε ποδοῖν | λαιψηροδρόμον 'Αχιλῆ, E.*IA* 206/7, where it is used to emphasize Achilles' running speed. It has has been suppleted by Kenyon in ἵππους τέ οἱ ἰςαν[έμους], B.20.9.

[187] Cf. e.g. *Il.*20.360, 3.431, etc.

a pancratiast.[188] Second, the seemingly redundant use of χερcί with acts of using weapons is as such reminiscent of the epic style,[189] to the effect that the very redundancy of χερcί helps to present the deeds of young Achilles as prefiguring his exploits at Troy.

For **θαμινόc**, 'in large quantities, crowded, close-set,' cf. e.g. *h.Merc.*43-5. For θαμινά, 'often,' used as an adverb, cf. *O.*1.53, *Pae.*6.14-8, Ar.*Pl.*292, X.*Mem.*3.11.15. For the asyndeton see the general note on structure above (pp. 339-41).

46-7. μάχαι λεόντεccιν ἀγροτέροιc ἔπραccεν φόνον | κάπρουc τ' ἔναιρε 'He dealt death in battle to wild lions and he slew boars.' μάχαι, evoking associations with the battlefield rather than with hunting, helps to present Achilles' exploits in his childhood as prefiguring his great deeds before Troy. The same is true for the verb **ἐναίρω**, which, by virtue both of its denotation ('slaying' of men in battle) and of the context in which it most frequently occurs,[190] evokes associations with the battlefields of Troy.

The same metaphorical usage, with reference to the killing of beasts, occurs in: ἦ τοι βέλτερόν ἐcτι κατ' οὔρεα θῆραc ἐναίρειν | ἀγροτέραc τ' ἐλάφουc, ἢ κρείccοcιν ἶφι μάχεcθαι, *Il.*21.485/6, where Hera rebukes Artemis for opposing her on the battlefield; the metaphor is highly functional: what Artemis means to do is ἐναίρειν, 'slaying men on the battlefield,' but Hera tells her to mind her own business and 'slay' beasts instead.[191] In οὐ πτηνὸν ὄρνιν οὐδὲ θῆρ' ὀρειβάτην | τόξοιc ἐναίρων τοιcίδ', S.*Ph.*955/6, the choice of the verb may be motivated by the fact that Philoctetes' bow will be used in order to effect the sack of Troy instead ('If you take away my bow, you will slay alright, but I will not be able to "slay" beasts').

For the 'locative' dative **μάχαι**,[192] cf. κράτιcτον 'Αχιλέοc ἄτερ μάχαι, *N.*7.27. See further Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 131/2. For **ἀγρότεροc**, 'wild, living in the wilds', cf. *P.*3.4 (of Chiron who lived in the wilds), *P.*9.6 (of Cyrene, who, as a huntress, is at home in wild country), *Il.*2.852, 12.146, *Od.*17.295, etc. For the phrase **φόνον πράccω** cf. A.*Eu.*624; for πράccω τινί τι

---

[188] See my note on *N.*5.19.

[189] Cf. expressions like χερcί τε τὰ μακρόταт' ἔγχε' ἑλόντεc, *Il.*14.373; δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερcὶν ἔχοντεc, 4.533, 9.86; 15.474, etc.

[190] Apart from in Homer and Hesiod (*Th.*316, *Sc.*329), there are a few ocurrences of the verb in tragedy, mostly in lyric passages (S.*Ant.*871, *OC* 842, E.*Andr.*1182, *Supp.*821) and messenger speeches (A.*Th.*811), where epicisms are not uncommon. Apart from *h.l.*, Pindar uses the verb in *N.*10.15 and *Pae.*6.114, both in heroic contexts where epic associations are functional. This is an example of the relevance of the 'social meaning', in the terminology of Leech, *Semantics*, pp. 14-6, 23.

[191] This is also apparent from the fact that a *present* tense infinitive is used. This proves that the act of ἐναίρειν was already predominant in the minds of both interlocutors and that the *focus* is on the object ('If you want to slay, slay *beasts*').

[192] The MSS. have ἐν μάχαι, which does not scan. ἐν must have crept in from the margin, ἐν μάχαι being a gloss on μάχαι.

cf. A.*Pr.*660, E.*Ion* 37 (cf. 896), *El.*1133, etc. See further my note on *N.*5.36 (p. 161). For τ' see the general note on structure above (pp. 339-41).

•*Aspect:* In lines 44-52 only present tense stem forms occur. The finite verbs in the main clauses are: ἔπραccεν (46), ἔναιρε (47), κόμιζεν (48), ἐθάμβεον (50), and κράτεcκε (52). The value of the imperfects can be explained in two alternative ways. (i) Achilles' habits as a young boy are described and therefore these verbs express iterative actions. It has often been assumed that the present tense stem form is the natural choice for expressing iterative (and distributive) actions. Ruijgh,[193] e.g., seems to regard iterativity as an independent motive for the choice of the present tense stem form. Greek also has grammatical means with which the iteration in the past may be explicitly expressed, such as the iterative infix with the indicative and the particle ἄν. Schwyzer & Debrunner (II p. 278), and more recently Rijksbaron,[194] take the position that there is a natural affinity between iterativity and the present tense stem form, but that, on the other hand, iterative actions may be expressed by an aorist, in which case the explicit grammatical means mentioned secure the iterative interpretation. Following this well established theory, we would here have the quite undisturbing situation of iterative actions being expressed by present tense stem forms.[195] (ii) However, iterativity is disqualified as a decisive factor for aspect choice by Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 34/5, who concludes that "iterativity *as such* does not decide the choice of the aspect form: that actions are to be understood as iterative actions is made clear by grammatical means (the iterative suffix with the indicative, an optative) and/or by contextual indications" (p. 35). Thus also in his *Semantics of the Verb*, pp. 13-4 (with n. 17). There, on p. 86, Sicking shows that imperfect main verbs that move forward narrative time "characteristically provide introductory or otherwise subsidary material that owes its relevance to what is meant to be the main point of the thematic paragraph they are part of." It is tempting to interpret the imperfects as a signal presenting the narrative sequence about Achilles' deeds in his boyhood as introductory material that owes its relevance to the main point of the Achilles story as a whole, *viz.* Achilles' great deeds before Troy. Such a presentation would tie in neatly with Pindar's obvious concern to present the boy Achilles as prefiguring the man (see interpretation, pp. 211-3).

---

[193] C.J. Ruijgh, 'L' emploi 'inceptif' du thème du présant du verbe grec', *Mnemosyne* 38, 1985, 1-61.

[194] A. Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, Amsterdam 1984, 15/6.

[195] Thus Instone, *Selected Odes*, p. 162.

47-48. cώματα δὲ παρὰ Κρονίδαν | Κένταυρον ἀcθμαίνοντα κόμιζεν 'He brought their panting bodies to Cronus' son, the centaur.'[196]

• *Text:* cώματα is read by ms. V. D has cώματι, which has been corrected into cώματα. B has cωμάτια. All three mss. read ἀcθμαίνοντα. The scholion, found in all three mss., paraphrazes these lines as if they read cώματι ... ἀcθμαίνοντι (τῶι δὲ αὑτοῦ cώματι ἐνεργῶν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺc ἄcθματοc πλήρηc ἑξέτηc ὢν κυνηγῶν θῆραc ἐφόρει παρὰ Κρονίδην κένταυρον, 82, III 54/5 Dr.). The lemma of this scholion, however, reads cώματι only in D (as the text in D *ante correctionem*). In V the lemma reads cώματα (as the text in V) and in B the lemma reads cωμάτια (as the text in B). All this adds up to two alternatives. If the unamimous mss.-reading ἀcθμαίνοντα is accepted, cώματι is senseless ('With his body he brought them to the panting Centaur') and B's cωμάτια is unlikely since it would detract from Achilles's merits, which leaves only cώματα. The alternative is to accept the *varia lectio* suggested by the paraphrase and read cώματι ... ἀcθμαίνοντι. The semantics of ἀcθμαίνω leave open both options (see below).[197] **cῶμα,** however, would be very difficult to explain when referring to Achilles. In Pindar the noun may—contrary to Homer's practice—refer to living bodies, true, but in these cases the choice of the noun is motivated either by the fact that the context deals with death or mortality of the person concerned, or by the fact that the person referred to is for obvious reasons very deliberately presented as a 'mere' body. See my note on *P.*8.82 (p. 582). Neither one of these considerations would apply to the use of cῶμα here when referring to Achilles. The epic context in which the noun is used here makes this even more problematic, whereas cώματα referring to the dead (or nearly dead) bodies of animals would be completely in accordance with both the Homeric and Pindaric semantics of the noun. This pleads strongly in favour of reading cώματα ... ἀcθμαίνοντα. Moreover, if Achilles would be doing the panting, cώματι would be a weak and unnecessary addition, used for syntactic reasons rather than for semantic ones. Apart from this, emphasis upon the trouble Achilles had in bringing back the beasts he had killed would detract from his glory.[198] Finally, cώματα δέ can be more easily accounted for from a structural and narrative point of view

---

[196] Chiron the Centaur was Cronus' son. Cf. *P.*3.4, *P.*4.115, Σ.*ad h.l.*, etc. For Κένταυροc cf. *P.*3.45, *P.*9.38, *P.*4.103; cf. also *P.*2.44 (son of Ixion).

[197] *Pace* Dissen and Fennell *ad loc.*

[198] This objection must also be raised against Hartung's conjecture cώματα ... ἀcθμαίνων ἐκόμιζεν (adopted by Instone, *Selected Odes*, pp. 76, 162-4), which aims at evading the difficulties of cώματι, while having Achilles to do the panting (as it is suggested by the scholiast's paraphrase).

than σώματι δέ. σώματα is the *topic* that is to be expected: after a reference to Achilles killing beasts, it is quite understandible that a statement follows about what he did with the bodies. Topicalizing Achilles' body by means of σώματι δέ is a far less natural procedure in the context. See also my general note on the structure above (pp. 339-41). For the aspect see my note on 46-7 above (p. 344).

The verb **ἀσθμαίνω** means 'to breathe hard.' The verb is mainly epic.

The verb may refer to the act of 'panting,' as after running, as in τὼ δ' ἀθμαίνοντε κιχήτην, *Il.*10.376; οὐδὲν ἀσθμαίνων, A.*Eu.*651, 'without any effort'; or to the act of 'gasping for breath,' of one dying, as in αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἀσθμαίνων εὐεργέος ἔκπεσε δίφρου, *Il.*5.585; τὸν τρισκαιδέκατον μελιηδέα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα | ἀσθμαίνοντα, *Il.*10.495/6. Likewise, the noun ἆσθμα may refer to 'short-drawn breath,' as a symptom of hard labour, as in ἆσθμα καὶ ἱδρώς, *Il.*15.241; or as a symptom of dying, as in ὁ δ' ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ' ἄσθματι κῆρ ἀπινύσσων, | αἷμ' ἐμέων, ἐπεὶ οὔ μιν ἀφαυρότατος βάλ' Ἀχαιῶν, *Il.*15.10/1; or even to 'death-rattle,' as in καί νιν οὔπω τεθναότ', ἄσθματι δὲ φρίσσοντα πνοὰς ἔκιχεν, *N.*10.74.

49. ἑξέτης τὸ πρῶτον, ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον

'He started doing so (killing beasts and bringing them to Chiron) when he was six years old and he continued doing so all the time (the rest of his life).'[199] τὰ μέν in 43 introduces the temporal specification μένων Φιλύρας ἐν δόμοις, | παῖς ἐών, 'at first, in Philyra's home, when he was a child'. This temporal reference is restated in line 49 as ἑξέτης τὸ πρῶτον, which is balanced by ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἂν χρόνον. Achilles did not literaly continue to kill animals and bring the sports to Chiron, but he did continue to do the same approximately, namely to display the same qualities. Thus τὰ μέν helps to present the miraculous exploits of the boy Achilles as prefiguring his more known accomplishments at Troy.

Lines 43-9 describe a way of life. "Such still portraits of mythical figures are not very common on Pindar, who seems more concerned to represent his characters in action," Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 41 (on the myth of Cyrene in *O.*9). Burton cites *O.*6.54/5, *P.*4.78-83 and *P.*3.47-53 as other "vivid descriptions of living figures not primarily in action." The description of Achilles' youth here does have in common with the four other passages that it is a description of habits instead of a narrative account of single events.

[199] Τουτέστι τὸν ἅπαντα βίον τοῦτο ἐνήργει, Σ. 85, III 55 Dr.; cf. also Bowra's translation: 'in his sixth year at first, then through all his days' and Sandys' 'but afterwards for all his time'.

For **χρόνος** referring to the 'period of life', cf. εἴη cέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν, *O.*1.115[200]; καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ὁμοῖα, Κρονίδαι μάκαρες, | δίδοιτ' ἐπ' ἔργοιcιν ἀμφί τε βουλαῖc | ἔχειν, μὴ φθινοπωρὶc ἀνέμων | χειμερία κατὰ πνοὰ δαμαλίζοι χρόνον, *P.*5.118-21; ὄλβιοc δ' οὐδεὶc βροτῶν πάντα χρόνον, B.*fr.*54; πολλὰ γὰρ τάδε | ἐν τῶι μακρῶι γένοιτ' ἂν ἀνθρώπων χρόνωι, S.*Ph.*305/6.

The *suffix* **-έτηc** is a feature of epic diction. Cf. e.g. τρίετεc, *Od.*2.106, etc.; πεντάετεc, *Od.*3.115; ἑξάετεc, *ibid.*; ἑξετέ', *Il.*23.266, 655; ἑπτάετεc, *Od.*3.305, etc.; εἰνάετεc, *Il.*18.400, cf. also Hes.*Th.*801; τεccερακονταετήc, Hes.*Op.*441; ἑκατονταέτει, *P.*4.282. For the accentuation of such compound adjectives, cf. Ael.Dion. δ 23 (p. 115.5-6 Erbse); Arc. p. 27.22/3 Barker; Σ. A *ad Il.*23.266; Σ. A *ad Il.*2.765b. See also Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften*, 1147/8; Kühner-Blass, i. 545, n. 11; Chandler, *Greek Accentuation*, (2nd edition) § 703; Braswell on *P.*4.282(a).

For **ἀνά** in a temporal sense, cf. ὅτ' ἀμφότεροι κράτηcαν | μίαν ἔργον ἀν' ἀμέραν, *O.*9.84/5; ἀνὰ νύκτα, *Il.*14.80, 'all night through'; ἀνὰ χρόνον, Hdt.1.173, 2.151, 5.27, etc.

50-52

Artemis and brave Athena marvelled at him, that he killed deer without hounds or treacherous traps. For he defeated them by his feet. I have (know) this story (that has just preceded) as one that has been told by men of old.

50. τὸν ἐθάμβεον Ἄρτεμίc τε καὶ θραcεῖ' Ἀθάνα

For the relevance of the two goddesses see interpretation, p. 212. The relative pronoun resumes the *topic*—introduced as such in line 43 (ξανθὸc δ' Ἀχιλεύc, see note *ad loc.*) —of the entire preceding passage, including everything that has been said about it (cf. my note on τᾶc line 9 above, p. 257). Artemis and Athena are introduced as new subjects, to the effect that Achilles' deeds are presented from a new point of view.

For **θαμβέω**,[201] 'to be astonished at,' referring to the unchecked amazement of someone who is struck by something extraordinary; cf. θάμβηcαν δ' ὄρνιθαc, *Od.*2.155, of the amazement at the sight of two eagles being an omen from Zeus; θάμβηcε δέ μιν φίλοc υἱόc, | ταρβήcαc δ' ἑτέρωcε βάλ' ὄμματα, μὴ θεὸc εἴη, *Od.*16.179; τέραc δ' ἐθάμβουν, A.*Suppl.*570. For the verb without a direct object, cf. also *Il.*8.77, *Od.*4.638, B.5.84, S.*Ant.*1246, etc. The verb occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. The noun θάμβοc occurs in ἔcτα δὲ θάμβει δυcφόρωι | τερπνῶι τε μιχθείc. εἶδε γὰρ ἐκνόμιον | λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν | υἱοῦ, *N.*1.55-8, of Amphitryon standing in amazement at the sight of Heracles having killed the snakes. Cf. also *Il.*4.79, *Od.*3.372,

[200] On Segal's suggestion (*HSCPh* 68, 1964, 256, n. 26) see Gerber *ad loc.* (p. 176).
[201] The MSS. as well as the scholia read ἐθάμβευν, which would, however, disturb the responsion. Moschopulos' easy correction ἐθάμβεον is generally accepted.

E.*Rh.*291, etc. For the aspect, see my note on 46 ἔπραςςεν above. On the 'θαῦμα-motif', see A.M. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi. A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 93), Leiden 1986, 55, with n. 136. For **θραςύς**, 'brave,' see my note on *N.*5.39 (pp. 166/7).

Antistrophe Γ

51. κτείνοντ' ἐλάφους ἄνευ κυνῶν δολίων θ' ἑρκέων

Artemis and Athena were amazed at the fact that Achilles was able to kill deer, animals notorious for their running speed, without the usual aids to catch animals that easily outrun any normal human being. Achilles, like Heracles and Peleus, is emphatically said to have done things on his own, without the help of anybody or anything. Cf. ἰδίαι in line 24, ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών (33), and μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς (34), with my notes *ad locc.* The 'traps' are 'insidious, beguiling,' since they are designed to escape the notice of animals.[202]

A Laconian dog is presented as chasing animals in ἀπὸ Ταϋγέτοιο μὲν Λάκαιναν | ἐπὶ θηρςὶ κύνα τρέχειν | πυκινώτατον ἑρπετόν, *fr.*106.1-3. The methods used for hunting deer is described in detail in X.*Cyn.*9. Xenophon recommends the use of Indian dogs, notorious for their speed and strength (9.1). He emphasizes the trouble the dogs will have in catching deer (ἁλώςεται δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν κυνῶν ςὺν πόνωι διωκόμενος, 9.6, cf. also 9.10). The second part of his treatise on the hunt of deer is dedicated to the use of snares (ποδοςτράβαι, 9.11-20). He indeed gives detailed instructions for camouflaging the snares, ἵνα ἦι τῆι ἐλάφωι ὅτι μάλιςτα ἄδηλος ἡ ςτάςις (9.16).

52. ποςςὶ γὰρ κράτεςκε

Pindar endows the young boy with the most characteristic quality of the ποδὰς ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Il.*1.58, etc.) of the *Iliad.* See further interpretation, pp. 211-3.

For **κρατέω** with a dative noun referring to 'feet' or 'hands,' cf. κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾶι, *O.*10.100; ὃς ἂν χερςὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήςαις | τὰ μέγιςτ' ἀέθλων ἕληι τόλμαι τε καὶ ςθένει, *P.*10.23/4. The iterative infix presents Achilles' outrunning of deer as a habit: he was faster again and again. In the surviving *epinicia* by Pindar four occurences can be found, including *h.l.*, where the imperfect is formed with the iterativity-infix (**-ςκ-**): κυλινδέςκοντό τε κραιπνότεραι | ἢ βαρυγδούπων ἀνέμων ςτίχες, *P.*4.209/10, of the Symplegades, which clash together every time a ship passes by; χαλκέαις δ' ὁπλαῖς ἀράςςεςκον χθόν' ἀμειβόμενοι, *P.*4.226, where the itera-

[202] Cf. δολίων δέ, ὅτι θηρῶντες τοὺς θῆρας τὰ λίνα λάθρα ἱςτᾶςιν, Σ.*ad h.l.* (89b, III 55 Dr.).

tive (or, perhaps better: distributive[203]) value of the verb is supported by ἀμειβόμενοι. In τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν, *N.*5.31, on the other hand, an iterative interpretation is implausible; εὐθύς (33) above all gives the impression that Pindar is talking about one occasion. So the usage of ἔσκεν here is in keeping with the practice of Homer, who uses these iteratives as a metrical variation of an ordinary imperfect. See further my note *ad loc.* (p. 152). It is generally assumed that the infix -σκ- is a feature of Ionic dialect.[204] It is indeed true that this infix has epic connotations, which is in keeping with Pindar's habit of using it exclusively in his myths, where these connotations are functional, because they help to create an atmosphere of the remote past, which forms the setting of the story. Here the epic connotations are functional since they help to present the accomplishments of the young boy Achilles as prefiguring the mighty exploits of the man.

52-53. λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων | ἔπος ἔχω
'I have (know) this story as one that has been told by men of old'. Most critics take τοῦτο cataphorically, referring τοῦτο ... ἔπος to the story that follows, about Chiron educating Jason and Asclepius and giving Thetis away in marriage. προτέρων,[205] then, either has reference to earlier authorities for these stories (thus Σ.*ad h.l.*, 91 and 92, III 55/6 Dr.; Bury *ad loc.*, p. 55; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 189) or to the 'men of old' which these stories are about.[206]

The pronoun **οὗτος** is anaphoric in the vast majority of its occurrences.[207] Where the pronoun is prospective, the cataphoric interpretation is secured by explicit syntactical signals. In most cases the prospective use is indicated by an a.c.i.-construction, depending on the pronoun or on the noun phrase of which the pronoun is a part.

As in: ἐπεὶ χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι | πράσσοντί με τοῦτο θεόδματον χρέος, | φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν | Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, *O.*3.6-9; θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖς Ἰξίονα

[203] "Iterative actions are actions repeated by a singular or plural subject; distributive actions are actions repeated by more than one subject, whether simultaneously or successively" (see Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 34).

[204] See, e.g., A. Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, Amsterdam 1984, 15/6.

[205] All MSS. read πρότερον. B and V have προτέρων written above the line. Both readings, however, are to be regarded as interpretations, the manuscriptual evidence providing equal support for both, since Pindar himself could not make the difference in writing. The accusative is unlikely because of the internal structure of the sentence: 'λεγόμενον τοῦτο, namely πρότερον,' is awkward.

[206] Thus Fennell (*ad loc.*, p. 33): 'Oft-told is this story of men of yore which I have to tell'. In this case προτέρων would indicate that we go back in time, that what we are getting is a story about men who lived earlier than Achilles (cf. the function of πρότεροι in line 13 and παλαιαῖσι in line 32 above).

[207] Slater *s.v.*, 1.a/b lists about 65 anaphoric occurrences, on a total number of about 80 occurrences of the pronoun.

φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖς | λέγειν ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῶι | παντᾶι κυλινδόμενον· | τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι, *P.*2.21-4; φαντὶ δ' ἔμμεν | τοῦτ' ἀνιαρότατον, καλὰ γινώσκοντ' ἀνάγκαι | ἐκτὸς ἔχειν πόδα, *P.*4.287-9; καὶ ἔν τε θεοῖς τοῦτο κἀνθρώποις ὁμῶς | αἰδέοντ', ἀμφανδὸν ἁδείας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶς, *P.*9.40/1. In ἤθελον Χίρωνά κε Φιλλυρίδαν, | εἰ χρεὼν τοῦθ' ἁμετέρας ἀπὸ γλώσσας κοινὸν εὔξασθαι ἔπος, | ζώειν τὸν ἀποιχόμενον, *P.*3.1-3, the pronoun is looking backward and forward since it occurs in a parenthesis

The fact that the pronoun is pointing to what follows may also be indicated by the use of a relative pronoun, ὅτι, or εἰ.

Cf. εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑμνητὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ γίνεται σοφοῖς, | ὃς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήσαις | τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἕλῃ τόλμαι τε καὶ σθένει, *P.*10.22-4; ἀλλ' ἔσται χρόνος | οὗτος, ὃ καί τιν' ἀελπτίαι βαλὼν | ἔμπαλιν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώσει, τὸ δ' οὔπω, *P.*12.30-2; σὲ δ' ἐν τούτωι λόγωι | χρησμὸς ὤρθωσεν μελίσσας Δελφίδος αὐτομάτωι κελάδωι· | ἅ σε χαίρειν ἐστρὶς αὐδάσαισα πεπρώμενον | βασιλέ' ἄμφανεν Κυράναι, *P.*4.59-62[208]; τοῦτο δ' ἀμάχανον εὑρεῖν, | ὅτι νῦν ἐν καὶ τελευτᾶι φέρτατον ἀνδρὶ τυχεῖν, *O.*7.25/6; τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον ἕρπει, | εἴ τις εὖ εἴπῃ τι, *I.*4.40/1.

In τοῦτό γέ τοι ἐρέω· | καλῶν μὲν ὦν μοῖράν τε τερπνῶν | ἐς μέσον χρὴ παντὶ λαῶι | δεικνύναι, *fr.*42.2-5, the fact that the pronoun has posterior reference is indicated by the future ἐρέω.

Such explicit syntactical signals steering the hearer to a cataphoric interpretation of the pronoun are lacking here. This strongly pleads in favour of taking τοῦτο anaphorically here and referring τοῦτο .. ἔπος to the story that just preceded.

Parallels to this can easily be provided. In ἀπό μοι λόγον | τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον, *O.*9.35/6, Pindar refers back to the story that has just preceded (about Heracles fighting the gods). Cf. also καὶ γυναιξὶν καλλικόμοισιν ἀριστεύει πάλαι· | Ζεὺς ἐπ' Ἀλκμήναν Δανάαν τε μολὼν τοῦτον κατέφανε λόγον, *N.*10.10/1; Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν | ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾶι τοῦτ' ἔπος, *I.*6.66/7, with reference to μελέτη δέ τε ἔργον ὀφέλλει, Hes.*Op.*412, etc.

If τοῦτο ... ἔπος refers back to the story about Achilles' miraculous exploits as a child, προτέρων must refer to earlier authorities for this story.[209] Ironically, Pindar is our earliest authority for this story; although we shall never be able to establish with certainty that Pindar did not indeed know the story from an earlier source, now lost to us,

---

[208] Slater (*s.v.* οὗτος, p. 400), surprizingly, interprets the pronoun in this passage as anaphoric.

[209] Referring back προτέρων to the subject matter of this ἔπος ('I have this sory that is told about men of old'), Achilles being one—and the only one mentioned—of the πρότεροι, is unlikely, for such an assertion is unfunctional in the context. That the poet 'has' this story is clear enough from the very fact that he has just related it.

the evidence suggests that it is his own invention.[210] This may very well have been the reason for scholars not to take τοῦτο anaphorically, as it must be. One should, however, keep the possibility in mind of Pindar *pretending* that he draws his material from earlier authorities. Then, the reference is fictional, also to the extent that the audience would see through Pindar's pretence. It has been argued in the interpretation (pp. 212/3) that, whereas on the level of Pindar's fictional presentation his appeal to earlier authorities is meant to support his incredible story about the young Achilles,[211] it is, on the level of his real compositional concerns, a reference to the *Iliad*, underscoring the main point of his story.

• *Reference to earlier authorities:* Pindar claims support of earlier authorities in several passages,[212] and he may do so for a variety of reasons.

A situation similar to *h.l.* occurs in: φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ | ῥήϲιεϲ, οὔπω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεύϲ τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι, | φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει 'Ρόδον ἔμμεν ποντίωι, ἁλμυροῖϲ δ' ἐν βένθεϲιν νᾶϲον κεκρύφθαι, *O.*7.54-7. Verdenius *ad loc.* (p. 74) remarks: "The attempts made to reconstruct a 'Ρόδου Κτίϲιϲ which could have been used by Pindar, have produced mere hypotheses. This part of the story was probably invented by Pindar himself (Young, *Three Odes*, p. 87). ... In order to mask the fact that he partly invented it he applies the same trick as Plato, viz. emphasizing its remote origin (cf. παλαιὸν ἀκηκοὼϲ λόγον οὐ νέου ἀνδρόϲ, Pl.*Tim.*21a." If Young and Verdenius are right, the situation in *O.*7 has in common with our passage here that the reference to earlier authorities is a rhetorical means to camouflage personal mythological inventions or adaptions. On this passage, see also O. Smith, 'An Interpretation of Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode', *Class. Med.* 28, 1969, 181; Bernardini, *Mito e attualità*, p. 181 n. 59.

Pindar uses προτέρων to refer to Homer in μανθάνων οἶϲθα προτέρων | ἓν παρ' ἐϲλὸν πήματα ϲύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖϲ | ἀθάνατοι, *P.*3.80-2, with reference to *Il.*24.527-33. For a survey of the discussion among ancient and modern scholars whether Pindar misunderstood Homer here, see Young, *Three Odes*, pp. 50/1; further references are to be found there. Cf. also: ἐγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέοϲ ἀντέχομαι προφρόνωϲ | ἐν κορυφαῖϲ ἀρετᾶν μεγάλαιϲ, ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον, *N.*1.33/4, introducing the story of Heracles killing the snakes. Here again Pindar—perhaps together with Pherecydes of Athens—is our earliest authority for this story. And here again scholars have busied themselves in filling up what they believe is a gap in the transmission of texts (see Braswell, *ad loc.*, p. 57, with references). How-

---

210 See my note on lines 43-52 'Mythological Background' above.

211 Cf. Farnell *ad loc.* (p. 259): "this is said in apology for his statement of the boy's miraculous fleetness".

212 For Pindar citing Hesiod see my note on *P.*8.13/4, pp. 490/1.

ever, *O.*7 and *h.l.* prove the possibility of Pindar *pretending* that he draws his material from earlier authorities.[213]

A poet may also wish to disclaim responsibility for what he is saying (as in οὐκ ἐθέλων ἐνέπω προτέρων ἔπος, A.R.4.985), or he may want to stress the poets diversion from the way his subject was handled by his predecessors (as in cὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι, *O.*1.36, with Gerber *ad loc.*; οὔ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτήνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων | οὐδὲ ⟨ ⟩ Κενταύρων, πλάcμα⟨τα⟩ τῶν προτέρων, Xenoph.*fr.*B.1.21/2 W.; cf. also A.*Ag.*757). Reference to earlier authorities may also be a substitute for an elaborate account.

As in: πέταται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάccαc τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν (*sc.* Αἰακίδων)· καὶ ἐc Αἰθίοπαc | Μέμνονοc οὐκ {ἂν} ἀπονοcτήcαντοc ἔπαλτο· βαρὺ δέ cφιν | νεῖκοc Ἀχιλλεὺc | ἔμπεcε χαμαὶ καταβαὶc ἀφ' ἁρμάτων, | φαεννᾶc υἱὸν εὖτ' ἐνάριξεν Ἀόοc ἀκμᾶι | ἔγχεοc ζακότοιο. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι | ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον· ἕπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸc ἔχων μελέταν, *N.*6.48-55. Pindar praises the Aeacids by mentioning Achilles' victory over the Aethiopian king Memnon. Then he breaks off his story, saying that by relating it he was going along a road that also the ancients have discovered. He does approve of it (ἕπομαι, 55), but he has a different concern, viz. praising the victor. The reference to earlier authorities here is part of a break-off passage. The reference may be said to be a substitute for an eloborate enumeration of the exploits of members of the Aeacid stock. 'The Aeacids are famous all over the world, e.g. among the Aethiopians, since Achilles killed their king. For further examples, see the earlier authorities. I have a victor to praise.'

•*Literature:* For references to earlier authorities with the purpose to support the poet's words, see Illig, *Form der pindarischen Erzählung*, p. 17 n. 2, p. 20; G.W. Bond, *Euripides Hypsipyle*, Oxford 1963, 73. For the poet disclaiming responsibility by referring to earlier authorities, see T.C.W. Stinton, '"Si credere dignum est": Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others', *PCPhS* 202, 1976, 60-89, esp. p. 66. See in general B.A. van Groningen, *In Grip of the Past*, Leiden 1953.

For the syntax cf. ὥc ἐμοὶ φάcμα λέγει Κρονίδα | πεμφθὲν βαρυγδούπου Διόc, *O.*8.43/4. The noun is qualified by a congruent passive participle; the *agens* of the action which the participle refers to is expressed by a genitive attributive phrase to the noun group.

For **ἔχω** with an object referring to a person's knowledge see ὃc δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, line 41 above, with my note (p. 330).

---

[213] Alternatively, the adjective ἀρχαῖον could serve to indicate that the poet switches from the present to the past, the ἀρχαῖοc λόγοc being an 'ancient story', because it is a story about the past (cf. πρότεροι in line 13 and παλαιαῖcι in line 32 above).

53-64

Profoundly wise Chiron nursed Jason inside his stone dwelling, and next Asclepius, whom he tought the soft-handed law of herbs. Then, on another occasion, he arranged a wedding for Nereus' daughter with splendid breasts, and he cherished her matchless son for her, exalting his spirit in all things fitting, in order that, sent to Troy by the sea-blasts of the winds, he should stand up to the spear-clashing battle-cry of Lycians, Phrygians and Dardanians, and that, mingling his hands with the spear-carrying Ethiopians, he should fix it in his heart that their king Memnon, Helenus' fierce cousin, should not come back home.

From here the far shining light of the Aeacids is (firmly) fixed.

53-54. βαθυμῆτα Χίρων τράφε λιθίνῳ | Ἰάσον' ἔνδον τέγει
'Profoundly wise Chiron raised Jason inside his stone dwelling'. The λίθινον τέγος refers to Chiron's cave on Mount Pelion. The narrative, which has been interrupted by the poet making reference to earlier authorities in the preceding sentence, is now continued, which explains the asyndeton, for a fresh start is a situation in which the need to define any further the relation to the preceding context does not arise[214]. The re-entering of Chiron is constitutive of the continuity of the narrative.

For Chiron as Jason's educator cf. *P.*4.102/3 (cf. Σ.*ad loc.*), Hes.*fr.*40 M.-W. (quoted in the Σ.*ad h.l.*). The story of Jason being brought to Chiron is told in some detail in *P.*4.109-15. Cf. also Asclepiades *fr.*3 (*FHG* III 302 = Σ.*ad Od.*12.69), A.R.1.32/3 with Σ.*ad loc.*, Tzetz.*Chil.*6.984ff, etc. On Chiron as educator in general, see also West *ad* Hes.*Th.*1001; Vian *ad* A.R.1.558 (p. 254); Livrea *ad* A.R.4.813. See also my general note on 43-52 above (p. 335). Chiron's cave on Mount Pelion is referred to in *P.*3.1-5, 63, *P.*4.102, *P.*9.5, 30, etc. See also Bömer on Ov.*Fast.*5.379.

βαθυμῆτᾰ (Aeolic ending) occurs only here. The Aeolic ending in itself may have had an epic flavour (νεφεληγερέτα, ἱππότα, etc.). For the association of the adjective βαθύϲ with a 'profound' mind, cf. also Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων, *N.*7.1; ὅ τι κε ϲὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι | γλῶϲϲα φρενὸϲ ἐξέλοι βαθείαϲ, *N.*4.7/8; βαθείαϲ φροντίδοϲ, A.*Supp.*407, etc. The adjective is explained by the Σ.*ad h.l.* (92b, III 56 Dr.) as: οὐκ ἐπιπόλαια βουλευόμενοϲ ἀλλ' ἐν βαθεῖ. The noun **τέγοϲ**, means 'roof,' cf. e.g. ἀλλὰ κατ' ἀντικρὺ τέγεοϲ πέϲεν, *Od.*10.559 (cf. 11.64); ἀναβάντεϲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ τέγοϲ τοῦ οἰκήματοϲ, Th.4.48; Ar.*Nu.*1502 (cf. *V.*68), etc. Here it is used as *pars pro toto* for 'shelter, dwelling', as ἔνδον shows; cf. ἀνδριάντι ... | Κρῆτεϲ ὃν τοξόφοροι τέγεϊ Παρναϲϲίῳ | καθέϲϲαντο μονόδροπον φυτόν, *P.*5.40-2, where it probably refers to a treasury in Delphi. For **τρέφω** cf. *P.*4.115 (cf. *ibid.* 103), *P.*3.5, etc. **ἐνδόν** used as a preposition usually goes with the genitive (*Il.*20.13, 23.200, A.*Ch.*102, S.*Aj.*218, Pl.*Prt.*320d, etc.). Pindar uses it with the gen-

---

[214] See also Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 40-4.

itive in ἔνδον ... φαρέτρας, *O.*2.84; ἔνδον θαλάσσας, *O.*7.62; οἰκέοντας ἔνδον Ὀλύμπου, *P.*1.64. Apart from *h.l.*, Pindar uses the preposition once more with a dative, in ἐχρῆν δέ τιν' ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτωι | Αἰακιδᾶν κρεόντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι, *N.*7.44/5. Cf. also ἔνδον δὲ θαλάμοις, E.*fr.*203.1.

54. καὶ ἔπειτεν Ἀσκλαπιόν

The particle καί "is regularly employed, as δέ is not, to include several predicates within a context sharing the same subject, or at least *topic*."[215] Here the account of Chiron having educated Jason is ampliflied with the statement that he has done the same for another hero of old. ἔπειτεν is a relatively strong device for articulating a temporal sequence, explicitly presenting events from a chronological point of view.[216] The emphasis on the chronological posteriority of the second phrase to the first is somewhat surprizing here, since there seems no need explicitly articulating the sequence in this respect.

Asclepius was taken out of the body of his mother Coronis, while burning on a pyre, by Apollo, and he brought him to Chiron. See *P.*3.38-46 with Σ.*ad loc.* (cf. *P.*3.1-7). Cf. also *Il.*4.219, Apollod.3.10.3, Paus.2.26.6 (according to whom it was Hermes who snatched the child from the burning pyre), Philostr.*Her.*176, Nicand.*Ther.*438 ff., Hyg.*Fab.*202, *Astronom.* 2.40, Cornut.*Theol.*33 fin, Σ.*ad P.*1.109, Ov.*Met.*2.534 ff., etc.

55. τὸν φαρμάκων δίδαξε μαλακόχειρα νόμον

'Whom he taught the soft-handed νόμος of herbs.' Chiron is said to be responsible for the characteristic for which Asclepius is most renowned and which was associated with Asclepius more than with anyone else.

The adjective is a *hapax*. But cf. ἐσσὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος ... | χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλλοντα τρώμαν ἕλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν, *P.*4.270/1. Cf. also the opening lines of *N.*4: ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων | ἰατρός· αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ | Μοισᾶν θύγατρες ἀοιδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἁπτόμεναι. | οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει | γυῖα, τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος, 1-5. The effect the festivities celebrating the victory have on the victor are compared to the accomplishments of a doctor. The healing effect on the victor's limbs of both water and song is described in terms of μαλθακός (4/5). Notice also that the 'healing' done by the Muses is effected by means of touching (ἁπτόμεναι, 3). Cf. also μαλακαῖς χερσὶ σὺν Ἠπιόνης (i.e. Asclepius' wife), *AP* 6.244.4 (Crin.); ἀπέθησας | ἐπ' ἠπίας ... χεῖρας, Herod. 4.17/8, with Headlam *ad loc.* See also my note on *P.*8.6 (pp. 474/5).

---

[215] Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 14.

[216] See also Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 17/8.

νόμος may be used to refer to 'that which is in habitual practice' (LSJ), to structures determining human behaviour, which are either formulated by a higher authority, divine or human, or acknowledged by general practice. νόμος always has a prescriptive force. The 'way things are done' implies 'the proper way to do things.' νόμος is the 'norm,' the "Done Thing."[217] Thus the noun may refer to 'usage, custom, tradition, law, ordinance', etc. Here the genitive adjunct φαρμάκων defines the area to which the νόμος applies. Chiron taught Asclepius the 'Done Thing' with respect to medicinal herbs.[218] For a genitive adjunct defining the area to which the νόμος applies, cf. οὗτός τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος, Hes.*Op.*388; νόμος ἐμβολῆς καὶ διορθώσιος, Hp.*Mochl.*38. Perhaps also the association (etymological link, from our perspective) with νέμω underlies the choice of the noun here; cf. ὃ (*sc.* Ἀπόλλων) καὶ βαρειᾶν νόσων | ἀκέματ' ἄνδρεσσι καὶ γυναιξὶ νέμει, *P.*5.63/4.

56-57. νύμφευσε δ' αὖτις ἀγλαόκολπον | Νηρέος θύγατρα

'Then again he arranged a wedding for Nereus' daughter with splendid breasts,' *sc.* Thetis, who was married by Peleus. The verb **νυμφεύω** with a direct object either refers to the act of someone giving one's daughter to someone in marriage (mostly of the mother betrothing her daughter), or to the act of a man marrying a woman.

> Cf. εἰκότως δ' ἅμ' ἕσπετο | θυγατρὶ νυμφεύσουσα καὶ τὰ φίλτατα | δώσουσα, ἵν' ἡμᾶς ὄντας εὑρήσει κακούς. | τὴν δ' αὖ τάλαιναν παρθένον—τί παρθένον; | Ἅιδης νιν ὡς ἔοικε νυμφεύσει τάχα—| ὥς ᾤκτισ', E.*IA* 457-62, where in line 458 the verb refers to Clytaemnestra coming to give Iphigenia in marrige to Achilles,[219] whereas in line 461 the verb refers to Hades who will soon marry her. For the former cf. also [Clytaemnestra:] ὁ δὲ γάμος τίν' εἶχε πρόφασιν, ᾗ μ' ἐκόμισεν ἐκ δόμων; | [Old man:] ἵν' ἀγάγοις χαίρους' Ἀχιλλεῖ παῖδα νυμφεύσουσα σήν, *ibid.*884/5; οὐ γάρ σε μήτηρ οὔτε νυμφεύσει ποτὲ | οὔτ' ἐν τόκοισι σοῖσι θαρσυνεῖ, τέκνον, | παροῦσ', ἵν' οὐδὲν μητρὸς εὐμενέστερον. | δεῖ γὰρ θανεῖν με·, E.*Alc.*317-20, etc. For the latter, cf. e.g. E.*Med.*625 (cf. also 313), *Ion* 819, Isoc.10.59, etc.

νυμφεύω is surprising here, since Chiron did not 'betroth' Thetis in the technical sense, not being related to her. See interpretation, pp. 214, 228-31.

---

[217] West on Hes.*Op.*276, criticizing M. Oswald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy*, 1969.

[218] Cf. also the Σ.*ad h.l.* (95b, III 56 Dr.): νόμον δὲ τὴν διανέμησιν τῶν φαρμάκων καὶ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν λέγει.

[219] Her specific task being alluded to in lines 729-34.

• *Text:* There is much confusion is the mss. with respect to Thetis' epithet. B has (1) ἀγλαόκολπον with (2) ἀγλαόκαρπον written above the line. V has (3) ἀγλαόκαρνον with ἀγλαόκολπον written above the line. D reads (4) ἀγλαόκρανον *in litura.* (1) ἀγλαόκολπον, 'with a fair bossom,' is a *hapax*. It has been restored by Lobel in ἀγλαοκ[όλπου] Δωρίδοc, *fr.*128d.3. Pindar uses βαθύκολπος as an epithet for the Muses in *P.*1.12. In epic the same epithet is used to refer to the Trojan women (*Il.*18.122, 339, 24.215) and to Nymphs (*h.Cer.*5, *h.Ven.*257). Cf. also ἐρατῶν ἐκ βαθυκόλπων | cτηθέων, A.*Th.*864/5; Νυκτὸc μεγαλοκόλπου θύγατερ, B.*fr.*1b.3, of Hecate; Διώνυcoc δὲ φοβηθεὶc | δύcεθ' ἁλὸc κατὰ κῦμα, Θέτιc δ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπωι | δειδιότα, *Il.*6.135-7. (2) The most natural interpretation of ἀγλαόκαρπον would be 'bright-fruited,'[220] which makes it an inappropriate epithet for Thetis, who has nothing to do with vegetation. In ἁ δὲ τὰc χρυcάμπυκαc ἀγλαοκάρπουc τίκτεν ἀλαθέαc Ὥραc, *fr.*30.6/7, the epithet is in contrast highly appropriate for the Horae, the Seasons.[221] It has alternatively been explained as referring to the glory of her κάρποc Achilles (Tyrrell, quoted in Bury's note *ad loc.*, renders 'blest in the fruit of her womb,' as ἀριcτοτόκεια in Theoc.24.72, cf. also καρποτρόφοι, E.*Ion* 475 with line 922); but the prolepsis seems odd here. The interpretation of ἀγλαόκαρπον as 'bright-wristed' has been suggested by Paley. καρπόc, however, only means 'wrist' if this is explictly made clear by the context.[222] Moreover, I am not aware of any passage where wrists are singled out as a feature of beauty. (3) ἀγλαόκρᾱνον is a *hapax* too. It may be interpreted as 'with fair fountains,' which is odd for Thetis. It may also be interpreted as 'with a radiant head,' -κρανον being derived from κάρανον, for which χαλκεόκρανον δ' ἔπειτ' ἐξ | εἵλετο ἰόν, B.5.74/5, is a parallel. Fennell adopts this reading, interpreting it in the latter way; Bury takes it as suggesting both interpretations. (4) ἀγλαόκαρνον is a *hapax* too. It could perhaps be explained as a derivation of κάρανοc, but there is no evidence justifying this assumption. Only ἀγλαόκολπον and

---

[220] Cf. ἀπὸ τᾶc ἀγλαοκάρπου | Cικελίαc, *fr.*106.5/6; ὄγχαι καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι, *Od.*7.115, 11.589. In *h.Cer.*4 and 23 it is used as an epithet of Demeter and the Nymphs as givers of the fruits of the earth.

[221] *Pace* Slater (*s.v.*), who renders 'with beautiful wrists', which is a rather unfunctional epithet unless the Horae had wristwatches. For the association with vegetation cf. Ὧραι πολυάνθεμοι, *O.*13.17; φοινικοεάνων ὁπότ' οἰχθέντοc Ὡρᾶν θαλάμου | εὔοδμον ἐπάγοιcιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεα, *fr.*75.14/5. Eirene, one of the Horae, is called ἀγλαόκαρποc in an epigram on a Delphian inscription (iv B.C., *SIG* 274).

[222] Cf. ἐπὶ καρπῶι χεῖρα γέροντοc | ἔλλαβε δεξιτερήν, *Il.*24.671/2; Ὀδυcεὺc δὲ λαβὼν κύcε χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῶι, *Od.*24.398; καρποῖcι | χειρῶν, E.*Ion* 891/2; κἀπὶ καρπῶι γ' αὔτ' ἐγὼ χερὸc φέρω, *ibid.* 1009; τοὺc καρποὺc τῶν χειρῶν, X.*Cyr.*6.4.2.

ἀγλαόκρανον come into account. Although both epithets emphasize Thetis' physical beauty,[223] which is functional in the context dealing with her wedding, ἀγλαόκολπον fits the context better than ἀγλαόκρανον. Whereas 'with a radiant head' is somewhat flat, emphasis on Thetis' 'splendid breasts' gives exactly the touch of sensuality that fits the occasion.[224]

• *Coordination:* In lines 53-8 Chiron's deeds are recorded. He raised Jason and then Asclepius (53-4). Both statements are coordinated with **καί** (54), indicating that we stay in the same context: Chiron's accomplishments as an educator. And both events are explicitly articulated as a temporal sequence related chronologically by means of **ἔπειτεν** (54).[225] Then, in line 56, we get a different kind of accomplishment on Chiron's part, the fact that he arranged the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. This event is attatched to the preceding events by means of **δ'**, marking it as an independent step in the narrative. **αὖτις** (56) explictly places this event in the same chronological sequence of the two preceding events.

The adverb αὖτις (αὖθις) denotes 'at another occasion.' This includes the common[226] use of the adverb in the sense of 'again, anew,' as well as the less frequent occurances of the adverb in the sense required here, 'then,' articulating a sequence from a chronological point of view. Cf. ὦ τρεῖς κέλευθοι καὶ κεκρυμμένη νάπη, | δρυμός τε καὶ στενωπὸς ἐν τριπλαῖς ὁδοῖς, | αἳ τοὐμὸν αἷμα τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν ἄπο | ἐπίετε πατρός, ἆρά μου μέμνησθ' ὅτι | οἷ' ἔργα δράσας ὑμὶν εἶτα δεῦρ' ἰὼν | ὁποῖ' ἔπρασσον αὖθις; S.*OT* 1398-1403; ὑμᾶς δ' ἐγὼ πομποῖσιν ἐκ πάντων δίχα | ἔστειλ' ἱκέσθαι, τοῦτο μὲν τὰ Λαΐου | σέβοντας εἰδὼς εὖ θρόνων ἀεὶ κράτη, | τοῦτ' αὖθις, ἡνίκ' Οἰδίπους ὤρθου πόλιν | κἀπεὶ διώλετ', ἀμφὶ τοὺς κείνων ἔτι | παῖδας μένοντας ἐμπέδοις φρονήμασιν, S.*Ant.*164-9. αὖτις δέ responds to πρῶτα μέν, introducing a second argument, in: (I praise the Lacedaemonians), πρῶτα μὲν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ὅκως κοτὲ σοὺς δέξονται λόγους δουλοσύνην φέροντας τῇ Ἑλλάδι, αὖτις δὲ ὡς ἀντιώσονταί τοι ἐς μάχην καὶ ἢν οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες πάντες τὰ σὰ φρονέωσι, Hdt.7.102.

With respect to the orthography, all mss. have αὖθις here. In the six other Pindaric occurrances of the adverb the mss. unanimously read αὖτις, except in *O.*1.66 and in *P.*4.273 where most of the mss. have αὖτις, but some αὖθις. It seems best to follow Boeckh and the majority of editors after him, who normalize the orthography of the adverb *h.l.* in accordance with the manuscriptual evidence for the other passages.

---

[223] Cf. also ἀπὸ γὰρ ἀγλαῶν λάμπε γυίων σέλας | ὥτε πυρός, ἀμφὶ χαίταις δὲ χρυσεόπλοκοι | δίνηντο ταινίαι, B.17.103-7, of the Nereids.

[224] If the silence of the scholiasts about this epithet means anything, it is an indication that they had a text before them that did not read either ἀγλαόκαρνον or ἀγλαόκρανον, compounds demanding explanation.

[225] See also my note above on line 54.

[226] Cf. also Σ.*ad h.l.* (97b, III 56 Dr.): τὸ δὲ αὖθις οὐκ ἐκ δευτέρου, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ταῦτα.

57-58. γόνον τέ οἱ φέρτατον | ἀτίταλλεν

'And he raised her excellent son,' *sc.* Achilles. This brings us back to the point where the narrative started in line 43. For the mythological background, see my note above (p. 335).

ἀτιτάλλω refers to 'bringing up' children that are not one's own: τὴν Δολίος μὲν ἔτικτε, κόμιςςε δὲ Πηνελόπεια, | παῖδα δὲ ὥς ἀτίταλλε, δίδου δ' ἄρ' ἀθύρματα θυμῶι, *Od.*18.322/3; αὐτὰρ 'Αχιλλεύς ἐςτι θεᾶς γόνος, ἣν ἐγὼ αὐτὴ | θρέψα τε καὶ ἀτίτηλα καὶ ἀνδρὶ πόρον παράκοιτιν, | Πηλεῖ, *Il.*24.59-61 (Hera speaks); 'Ωκεανόν τε θεῶν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν, | οἵ μ' ἐν cφοῖcι δόμοιcι εὖ τρέφον ἠδ' ἀτίταλλον, *Il.*14.201/2 (Hera speaks); τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Φύλας εὖ ἔτρεφεν ἠδ' ἀτίταλλεν, | ἀμφαγαπαζόμενος ὡς εἴ θ' ἑὸν υἱὸν ἐόντα, *Il.*16.191/2; Ζῆνα μέγαν· τὸν μέν οἱ ἐδέξατο Γαῖα πελώρη | Κρήτηι ἐν εὐρείηι τρεφέμεν ἀτιταλλέμεναί τε, Hes.*Th.*479/80, etc.

Pindar uses the noun **γόνος** exclusively to refer to a son of a god or hero. Cf. *O.*6.36 (Iamus), *P.*2.42 (Centaur), *P.*3.4 (Chiron), *P.*4.123 (Jason), *I.*8.33 (Thetis' son), *Pae.*7b.52 (Apollo), *fr.*75 (Dionysus). In *O.*9.45 λίθινον γόνον refers collectively to the 'offspring race', produced by Deucalion and Pyrrha. In *O.*9.76 the mss. have Θέτιος † γόνος *contra metrum.*

The statement that Chiron raised the son, produced by the marriage just mentioned, is attatched to the preceding statement by means of **τε**, which, like καί, indicates that we stay in the same context, that both statements belong together, having the same referent (i.e. the marriage and its consequences), and that both events form one step in the narrative.

58. ⟨ἐν⟩ ἀρμένοιcι πᾶcι θυμὸν αὔξων

'Making his soul grow with respect to all proper things.' 'Growth' of the θυμός involves increase of physical and mental strength. Chiron educated Achilles, teaching him everything a man of his position and with his destiny needs to know, to the effect that Achilles became a strong, courageous and self-confident man.

Pindar combines two standardised expressions, ἄρμενα πάντα παραcχεῖν (or παρέχειν) and ἀέξεται θυμός.[227]

ἄρμενα (~ ἀραρίcκω), used as a noun, refers to what is 'fitting, appropriate' in the given circumstances. For supplying ἄρμενα as part of a child's education, cf. παῖδας ἐπεὶ θρέψαιο καὶ] ἄρμενα π[άντα παράcχοιc, Thgn.275. Cf. also οὐ δύναμαί cοι θυμὲ παραcχεῖν ἄρμενα πάντα· | τέτλαθι· τῶν δὲ καλῶν οὔ τι cὺ μοῦνος ἐρᾶιc, Thgn.695/6. In ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κείνοιcι

---

227 The MSS. unanimously read ἀτίταλλεν ἀρμένοιcι πάντα θυμὸν αὔξων, which does not scan. Erasmus Schmid's suppletion of ἐν (presupposing a quite plausible haplography), restores the metre. Mingarelli's (and Hecker's) correction πᾶcι for πάντα is confirmed by the paraphrase of the Σ.*ad h.l.* (101a, III 56 Dr.): εἰς ταῦτα ἀτίταλλε τὸν 'Αχιλλέα ὁ Χείρων ἁρμοcτὰ αὐτῶι πάντα παρέχων. Moreover, ἄρμενα πάντα seems to be a standardised phrase, as appears from Thgn.275, 695, Hes.*Th.*639, *Sc.*84, quoted below.

παρέcχεθεν ἄρμενα[228] πάντα, | νέκταρ τ' ἀμβροςίην τε, τά περ θεοὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδουςι, | πάντων ⟨τ'⟩ ἐν cτήθεςςι ἀέξετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ, Hes.*Th*.639/40, ἄρμενα refers to the things 'fitting' for a meal of the gods. The wholesome effect of the meal is described in terms of the θυμός 'growing, increasing' (*v.i.*). Cf. also: ἵκετο δ' ἐς Κρείοντα καὶ Ἡνιόχην τανύπεπλον, | οἵ ῥά μιν ἠcπάζοντο καὶ ἄρμενα πάντα παρεῖχον, | ἣ δίκη ἔcθ' ἱκέτηιςι, Hes.*Sc*.83-5; τοῖcί κεν ἄρμενα πάντα παροπλίccαιο δέλτερα, Numen. *ap*. Ath.306c; ὣς φάτο· μείδηcεν δὲ βίη Ἡρακληείη | θυμῶι γηθήςας· μάλα γάρ νύ οἱ ἄρμενα εἶπεν, Hes.*Sc*.115/6; Ἀΐδα τοι λάθεται ἄρμενα πράξαις ἀνήρ, *O*.8.73.

In ἦ οὐχ ἅλις, ὡς τὸ πάροιθεν ἐκείρετε πολλὰ καὶ ἐcθλὰ | κτήματ' ἐμά, μνηcτῆρες, ἐγὼ δ' ἔτι νήπιος ἦα; | νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ μέγας εἰμὶ καὶ ἄλλων μῦθον ἀκούων | πυνθάνομαι καὶ δή μοι ἀέξεται ἔνδοθι θυμός, | πειρήcω, ὥς κ' ὔμμι κακὰς ἔπι κῆρας ἰήλω, | ἠὲ Πύλονδ' ἐλθὼν ἢ αὐτοῦ τῶιδ' ἐνὶ δήμωι, *Od*.2.312-7, Telemachus describes the effect of his growing up and learning what the wooers are really doing as **ἀέξεται θυμός**, in terms of his θυμός, 'growing, increasing.' In our frame of reference we would probably say that his self-confidence has increased, which enables him to speak openly to them on this occasion. In μυρίαι δ' ἀνδρῶν ἐπιcτᾶμαι πέλονται· | ἢ γὰρ c̣[ο]φὸς ἢ Χαρίτων τιμὰν λελογχὼς | ἐλπίδι χρυcέαι τέθαλεν | ἤ τινα θευπροπίαν εἰδώς· ἕτερος δ' ἐπὶ παιcὶ | ποικίλον τόξον τιταίνει· | οἱ δ' ἐπ' ἔργοιcίν τε καὶ ἀμφὶ βοῶν ἀ[γ]έλαις | θυμὸν αὔξουcιν, B.10.38-45, one category of men is said to base their power[229] on crafts (ἔργοιcιν) and animal husbandry. One's θυμός may also 'grow, increase' as an effect of a good meal as in Hes.*Th*.639/40, quoted above. Cf. also (Hector speaking to his allies:) οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ πληθὺν διζήμενος οὐδὲ χατίζων | ἐνθάδ' ἀφ ὑμετέρων πολίων ἤγειρα ἕκαcτον, | ἀλλ' ἵνα μοι Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα | προφρονέως ῥύοιcθε φιλοπτολέμων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν. | τὰ φρονέων δώροιcι κατατρύχω καὶ ἐδωδῆι | λαούς, ὑμέτερον δὲ ἑκάcτου θυμὸν ἀέξω, *Il*.17.225/6, 'with this intent I waste the substance of my own people, in order to increase your strength (honour, self-confidence and self-esteem) with gifts and food'. Cf. also τοῦ{δε} γὰρ ἀέξετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ cτήθεςςι φίλοιcι, Hes.*fr*.317 M.-W. See also Onians, p. 48. For the idea of 'increasing' part of the soul in the course of educating a young man it is instructive to compare also Pl.*R*.550a/b.

For the use of **ἐν**, marking the sphere in which an activity takes place, see my note on ἐν in line 32 above (pp. 315/6).

Epode Γ

59. ὄφρα

Chiron's education of Achilles is presented as having been intended to prepare him for the expedition to Troy.

---

[228] ἅρματα, *v.l.* See West *ad loc.*

[229] Cf. also "'vergrößern ihr Selbstbewußtsein' aufgrund ihres Besitzes", Maehler *ad loc.* (II, p. 191).

On final clauses in Pindar, see: H. van Daele, *L'optatif grec. Essai de syntaxe historique*, Paris 1897, 97 ff.; B.L. Gildersleeve, 'On the Final Sentence in Greek', *AJPh* 4, 1883, 416-44; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 346-8; Knuenz, *De enuntiatis Graecis finalibus*, Innsbruck 1913; P. Monteil, *La phrase relative en grec ancien*, Paris 1963, 402; P. Weber, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze*, I, Würzburg 1884, p. 72.

59-60. θαλαςςίαιϲ ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖϲι πεμφθεὶϲ | ὑπὸ Τροΐαν

'Sent close up under the walls of Troy by the sea-blasts of the winds.' This participle clause gives a new local and temporal orientation. The narrative started in line 43 on Mount Pelion with Achilles' childhood. After a chronological record of some of Chiron's accomplishments in lines 53-7, and after a second mention of Achilles' childhood in his cave in lines 57/8, the story now focuses on Achilles' great deeds as a man. See also my note on 61/2 (p. 362). θαλαςςίαιϲ ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖϲι is a pictorial and poetic equivalent to 'by sea'.

The noun **ῥιπή** may refer to any 'force, impulse,' causing movement. For ῥιπή referring to the 'blasts' of winds or waves, cf. ὠκυπόρουϲ | κυμάτων ῥιπὰϲ ἀνέμουϲ[230] τ', *P.*4.194/5; ὑπὸ ῥιπῆϲ αἰθρηγενέοϲ βορέαο, *Il.*15.171, 19.358; *P.*9.46-8, *fr.*33d.1/2, *fr.*140c, B.5.46-9, S.*Ant.*137, A.R.2.1114, 1228-30, etc. It is interesting to compare also: (Ajax) ὃν κράτιϲτον Ἀχιλέοϲ ἄτερ μάχαι | ξανθῶι Μενέλαι δάμαρτα κομίϲαι θοαῖϲ | ἂν ναυϲὶ πόρευϲαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο πομπαὶ | πρὸϲ Ἴλου πόλιν, *N.*7.27-30, where Pindar says exactly the same without using any of the words used here.

For **ὑπό** with an accusative referring to a motion of coming 'close up under' the walls of a lofty citadel, cf. ἤλθεθ' ὑπὸ Τροίην πόλεμον θραϲὺν ὁρμαίνοντεϲ, *Od.*4.146; ὑπὸ τεῖχοϲ ἰόνταϲ, *Il.*12.264; *Il.*2.216 (cf. 673, 249, 492), *Il.*23.297, *Il.*11.181/2, *Il.*4.407, *Il.*22.143/4, etc. For **πέμπομαι** in the sense of 'being send' by the winds over the sea, cf. e.g. ϲὺν Νότου δ' αὔραιϲ ἐπ' Ἀξείνου ϲτόμα πεμπόμενοι | ἤλυθον, *P.*4.203/4.

60-61. δορίκτυπον ἀλαλὰν Λυκίων τε προϲμένοι καὶ Φρυγῶν | Δαρδάνων τε

'(In order that he should) stand up to the spear-clashing battle-cry of Lycians, Phrygians and Dardanians.' This is the first of both goals of Chiron's education: Achilles must stand his ground on the battlefield of Troy. The three peoples mentioned are exemplary for the host of enemies Achilles had to face. The unparallelled expression δορίκτυπον ἀλαλάν, 'the noise of enemies shouting out their battle cries, mixed with the noise of the clashing of spears,' vividly conjures up the battlefield. It is not unimportant that Achilles seems to do everything alone here. Not a single reference is made to the Greek army

---

[230] ἀνέμων *v.l.*

or to any other hero standing at Achilles' side in the Trojan war. The emphasis upon peoples as his opponents reinforces this point; he alone matches entire nations (contrast the passages in which Pindar focusses upon individual opponents: e.g. *O*.2.81/3, *I*.5.39-41, *I*.8.54/5). This presentation parallels the self-reliance of Heracles and Peleus. See further interpretation, pp. 201, 203, 207, 212, 215/6, 230.

For **δορίκτυπος**, 'with clashing spears,' cf. πόλιν γὰρ φιλόμολπον οἰκεῖ δορικτύπων | Αἰακιδᾶν, *N*.7.9/10. The adjective is reminiscent of Homeric expressions like δοῦπος ἀκόντων (*Il*.11.364, 16.361). Cf. also τόσσος γὰρ κτύπος ἦεν—ἀυτὴ δ' οὐρανὸν ἶκεν— | βαλλομένων σακέων τε καὶ ἱπποκόμων τρυφαλειῶν | καὶ πυλέων, *Il*.12.338-40; ἀκούετ' ἢ οὐκ ἀκούετ' ἀσπίδων κτύπον; | ... | κτύπον δέδορκα· πάταγος οὐχ ἑνὸς δορός, A.*Th*.100-3; εἰ δὲ μὴ Φρυγῶν | πύργους πεσόντας ἤσμεν Ἑλλήνων δορί, | φόβον παρέσχεν οὐ μέσως ὅδε κτύπος, E.*Hec*.1111-3.

The noun **ἀλαλά**, onomatopaeic without doubt, is used to refer to a 'battle cry,' as a metaphor for war, in: ἢ ὅτε καρτερᾶς Ἄδραστον ἐξ ἀλαλᾶς ἄμπεμψας ὀρφανὸν | μυρίων ἑτάρων ἐς Ἄργος ἵππιον; *I*.7.10/1. In κλῦθ' Ἀλαλά, Πολέμου θύγατερ, | ἐγχέων προοίμιον, *fr*.78.1/2, 'battle cry' is personified as the daughter of war and called 'prelude to (the clashing of) spears'; κλῦθ' Ἀλαλά is a striking *oxymoron*. In ἐν δὲ Ναΐδων ἐρίγδουποι στοναχαὶ | μανίαι τ' ἀλαλ[αί] τ' ὀρίνεται ῥιψαύχενι | σὺν κλόνωι, *fr*.70b.11-4, the noun refers to the wild crying in Dionysaic rites.[231] Cf. also E.*Ph*.337. Pindar uses the noun ἀλαλατός in *P*.1.71/2; cf. also *Il*.16.77-9, Hes.*Th*.685/6, etc. (in epic this noun is also used less specifically with reference to other kinds of loud shouting: *Il*.2.149/50, *Il*.21.9-11, etc.). The verb ἀλαλάζω occurs in *O*.7.35-7, portraying Athena as the goddess of war; cf. also S.*Ant*.133, *HF* 981, *El*.843, X.*An*.5.2.14, etc.

The verb **προσμένω** occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. For this verb used transitively, cf. ἀλλ' ὄφρά τις ζώει καὶ ὁρᾶι φάος ἠελίοιο | εὐσεβέων περὶ θεούς, ἐλπίδα προσμενέτω, Thgn.1143/4; καὶ μὴν τοσοῦτόν ἐστί μοι τῆς ἐλπίδος, | τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν βοτῆρα προσμεῖναι μόνον, S.*OT* 836/7, etc. Pindar uses παραμένω to refer to the act of 'standing one's ground' in battle in λόγον ..., | τὸν ὄνπερ ποτ' Ὀϊκλέος παῖς ἐν ἑπταπύλοις ἰδὼν | υἱοὺς Θήβαις αἰνίξατο παρμένοντας αἰχμᾶι, *P*.8.39/40 (with my note, pp. 528-9); οἵαις ἐν πολέμοισι μάχαις | τλάμονι ψυχᾶι παρέμειν', *P*.1.47/8. The use of the verb here, in combination with the emphasis upon peoples as Achilles' opponents, emphasises Achilles' endurence.

For the Lycians, Trojan allies under the command of Sarpedon and Glaucus, cf. *Il*.2.876, 12.317, 417, 16.421, etc. Pindar mentions Sarpedon as a Lycian commander in *P*.3.112. For the Phrygians, Trojan allies under

---

231 For the noun in Dionysiac contexts cf. also E.*Ba*.592/3, 1133, *Hel*.1343/4, Σ.*ad* *O*.7.68. For the noun referring to the sound of orgiastic musical instruments cf. E.*Cyc*.65, *Hel*.1352, A.*fr*.57, *AP* 6.51.5/6, etc.

the command of Phorcys and Ascanius, cf. *Il.*2.862, 9.185, 10.431, etc. Pindar mentions them in *fr.*347. For the Dardanians, under the command of Aeneas, cf. *Il.*2.701, 819, 3.456, 7.414, 8.154, 16.807, etc. Pindar mentions Dardania, i.e., Troy in *Pae.*6.90 and perhaps in *Pae.*18.7. Δαρδανίδαι occur in *Pae.*8a.17 and *fr.*120. Cassandra is called Dardanian, i.e., Trojan in *P.*11.20. The enumeration may have a climactical order, to the extent that the Dardanians are the Trojans themselves. Moreover, it is striking that the order here is the reverse of the order in which they are mentioned in the catalogue of Trojan forces in *Il.*2.816-77.

For **τε ... καί ... τε**, cf. φόρμιγγα τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέcιν, *O.*3.8; γᾶν τε καὶ πόντον κατ' ἀμαιμάκετον, | ὅc τ' ἐν αἰνᾶι Ταρτάρωι κεῖται, *P.*1.14/5; μῆλά τε γάρ τοι ἐγὼ | καὶ βοῶν ξανθὰc ἀγέλαc ἀφίημ' ἀγρούc τε πάνταc, *P.*4.148/9; ἀλλά με Πυθὼ τε καὶ τὸ Πελινναῖον ἀπύει | 'Αλεύα τε παῖδεc, *P.*10.4/5; Κρονίδαι τε Δὶ καὶ Νεμέαι | Τιμαcάρχου τε πάλαι, *N.*4.9/10; Οὐλυμπίαι τε καὶ 'Ιcθμοῖ Νεμέαι τε, *N.*4.75, etc. Cf. also *O.*7.81-7, *O.*13.106-12, *P.*4.194-6. The tendency in the enumerations quoted is that the third member belongs to the first and second in a lesser degree than the first and second belong together. Here the Lycians and Phrygians, Trojan allies, belong together to a higher degree than the Dardanians, i.e., the Trojans themselves, belong to the other two.

61. καί

καί coordinates both members of the ὄφρα clause. The statement that Achilles should stand his ground on the Trojan battlefield is amplified and made more specific by the statement that he should kill the Ethiopian sultan Memnon.

That δέ is a real alternative in these situations appears, e.g., from: ὄφρα Μηδείαc τοκέων ἀφέλοιτ' αἰδῶ, ποθεινὰ δ' Ἑλλὰc αὐτὰν | ἐν φραcὶ καιομέναν δονέοι μάcτιγι Πειθοῦc, *P.*4.218/9. For δέ coordinating subordinate clauses, cf. also *O.*1.22, *O.*7.5, *O.*9.31, *P.*1.45, *P.*3.39, 92, *P.*4.264, *N.*5.7, *N.*10.86, *I.*1.68, *I.*7.14, *fr.*33c.5, *fr.*124.6.

61-62. ἐγχεcφόροιc ἐπιμείξαιc | Αἰθιόπεccι χεῖραc

'Mingling his hands with the spear-carrying Ethiopians.' After the general local and temporal orientation θαλαccίαιc ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖcι πεμφθεὶc | ὑπὸ Τροΐαν in lines 59/60, this second participle clause gives a more specific orientation. The narrative now focuses on one of the last stages of the Trojan war (beyond the scope of the *Iliad*), when the Ethiopians appeared on the scene.

For the idea of 'mingling one's hands with the enemy,' cf. ἄνδρεc φίλοι, ἐγὼ ὑμᾶc ὁρῶν αὐτοὺc μὲν καθωπλιcμένουc οὕτω καὶ ταῖc ψυχαῖc παρεcκευαcμένουc ὡc εἰc χεῖραc cυμμείξονταc τοῖc πολεμίοιc, κτλ, X.*Cyr.*2.1.11. Cf. also οὐ μὰν ἔc γε χορὸν κέλετ' ἐλθέμεν, ἀλλὰ μάχεcθαι. | ἡμῖν δ' οὔ τιc τοῦδε νόοc καὶ μῆτιc ἀμείνων, | ἢ αὐτοcχεδίηι μεῖξαι χεῖράc τε μένοc τε, *Il.*15.508-10; αἴδετο γάρ ῥα | πατροκαcιγνήτοιο μιγήμεναι ἐν παλάμηcιν, *Il.*21.468/9. One may also compare

ἔνθα κελαινώπεςςι Κόλχοιςιν βίαν | μεῖξαν[232] Αἰήται παρ' αὐτῶι, *P.*4.212/3; μείξαντες ἀλλάλοις' Ἄρευα, Alc.*fr.*330 L.-P.; εἴην ὅθι δαΐων | ἀνδρῶν τάχ' ἐπιςτροφαὶ | τὸν χαλκοβόαν Ἄρη | μείξουςιν, S.*OC* 1044-7.

The use of μείγνυμι in these contexts may also be compared to: ὣς μεμαὼς Τρώεςςι μίγη κρατερὸς Διομήδης, *Il.*5.143; ἀρᾶται δὲ τάχιςτα μιγήμεναι ἐν δαΐ λυγρῆι, *Il.*13.286 (cf. *Il.*14.386/7); ὣς τῶν μιςγομένων γένετο ἰαχή τε πόνος τε, *Il.*4.456, etc. Cf. also πρὶν γὰρ ἢ ςυμμεῖξαι ἡμέας ἐς χειρῶν τε νόμον ἀπικέςθαι, κτλ, Hdt.9.48; ἐπειδὴ δὲ προςμείξειαν, οἱ ἐπιβάται ἐς χεῖρας ἰόντες ἐπειρῶντο ταῖς ἀλλήλων ναυςὶν ἐπιβαίνειν, Th.7.70, etc. For the idea of 'turning the enemy over to one's hands,' it is also instuctive to compare Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολκὸν | πολεμίαι χερὶ προςτραπὼν | Πηλεύς, *N.*4.54-6. See also introduction, pp. 30/1.

The adjective **ἐγχέςφορος** is a *hapax*, modelled on ἐγχέςπαλος (*Il.*2.131, of the Trojan allies; 14.449, of Polydamas; 15.605, of Ares; B.5.69/70, of the son of Porthaon). Memnon is said to have carried a κραταιὸν ἔγχος in *P.*6.34. For the Ethiopians see further my note on 62/3 below (pp. 366/7).

62. ἐν φραςὶ πάξαιθ'

'He should fix it in his heart' (that their king Memnon would not come home). This expression is without parallel. The middle indicates that the φρένες are Achilles' own φρένες. The dependent ὅπως clause (62/3) formulates a firm determination on Achilles' part. It is worth noting that Pindar does not say θυμὸν αὔξων ὄφρα ... μὴ Μέμνων μόλοι. The emphasis is not merely on the killing, but on Achilles' determination to kill (contrast *N.*6.49-53). Moreover, this determination is presented as one of the aims of Chiron's education. Chiron's purpose becomes Achilles' determination. See further interpretation, pp. 228-31.

The expression may be a strong variation on more common expressions like: κότον ἔνθετο θυμῶι, *Od.*11.102; ἐμὴν χάριν ἔνθεο θυμῶι, Thgn.1321. A similar unparallelled strong expression is ὁπόταν τις ἀμείλιχον | καρδίαι κότον ἐνελάςηι, *P.*8.8/9 (see my note, pp. 479-83).

The idea of a deity putting a plan, or a state of mind, into someone's φρένες is not uncommon. Cf. e.g. φρεςὶν ἔμβαλον ἄγριον ἄτην, *Il.*19.88; φᾶρος μέν μοι πρῶτον ἐνέπνευςε φρεςὶ δαίμων | ςτηςαμένηι μέγαν ἱςτὸν ἐνὶ μεγάροιςι ὑφαίνειν, *Od.*19.138/9, etc.

Since the normal sort of thing to 'fix' in someone's φρένες is a weapon (cf. e.g. *N.*7.25-7, *fr.*163, *Il.*4.460/1, *Il.*5.40 [cf. 6.10, 8.95, 8.258, 11.447, 22.283], *Il.*13.370-3 [cf. 398], *Il.*13.570, *Il.*15.650, *Od.*22.83, etc.; on the semantics of the verb πάγνυμι, see also my note on *N.*5.29, p. 148), the

---

[232] Schroeder: μίξαν MSS. See Braswell *ad loc.*

expression ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ'—especially the verb πήγνυμι—may evoke associations with the battlefield. These general associations with a battlefield are functional in this context, and the fact that ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' evokes them may account for the choice of the expression here,—instead of the choice of more common expressions like ἔνθετο θυμῶι. On the other hand, the expression remains somewhat problematic, since the more specific association of fixing a weapon in someone's φρένες is inappropriate because of the φρένες being Achilles' own.

Activities like 'knowing, thinking, planning, etc.' are not seldom located[233] in a person's φρένες. The activity οἶδα takes place in the φρένες in *Il.*2.213, 5.326, 17.325, 24.197, *Od.*19.248, Thgn.135, etc. νοέω is located in de φένες in *Il.*9.600, 15.81, 22.235, *Od.*1.322, Sem.7.27, Hes.*Th.*488, etc. γιγνώσκω in the φρένες is found in *Il.*24.563, *Od.*1.420, 22.501, etc. One holds γνώμην φρεσί in Thgn.1173. The act μήδομαι is located in the φρένες in *Il.*21.19, 23.176, etc. For μερμηρίζω in the φρένες, cf. *Od.*1.427, 11.204, 22.333. The activity μέλω takes place in the φρένες in Hes.*Op.*531. In *O.*8.24, the ast of διακρίνειν takes place with the help of the φρένες. Various emotions may be located in someone's φρένες, such as anger (*Il.*16.61, 19.127, Hes.*Th.*554, *Op.*47, etc.), desire (*Il.*14.221, *Od.*2.34, etc.), hope (*I.*2.43, cf. B.*fr.*20b.8), joy (*Il.*13.609, 19.19, *Od.*5.74, Thgn.787, etc.), pity (*Il.*11.794, 16.36), shame (*Il.*10.237), suffering (*Od.*7.219, 11.195, Sol.4a.1 W.), and the like. The φρένες are the location of Medea's burning love in *P.*4.219, cf. also *N.*10.29. Fear may have its effect on someone's φρένες, as in *P.*9.32 and in line 39 above (see also my note, p. 324).

•*Literature:* On φρήν, especially in the lyric poets, see, *i.a.*: A.W.H. Adkins, *From the Many to the One*, Ithaca 1970, 19/20; S.M. Darcus, '*Noos* Precedes *Phren* in Greek Lyric Poetry', *AC* 46, 1977, 41-51; S.M. Darcus, 'A Person's Relation to φρήν in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets', *Glotta* 57, 1979, 159-73; Shirley Darcus Sullivan, 'A Study of φρένες in Pindar and Bacchylides', *Glotta* 67, 1989, 148-189; D.J. Furley, 'The Early History of the Concept of the Soul', *BICS* 3, 1956, 2-3; E.L. Harrison, 'Notes on Homeric Psychology', *Phoenix* 14, 1960, 64; S. Ireland & F.L.D. Steel, 'Φρένες as an Anatomical Organ in the Works of Homer', *Glotta* 53, 1975, 183-94; V.N. Jarcho, 'Zum Menschenbild der nachhomerischen Dichtung', *Philologus* 112, 1968, 166-72; Onians, *Origins of European Thought*, pp. 23-40; D. Sansone, *Aeschylean Metaphors for Intellectual Activity*, Wiesbaden 1975; B. Snell, *Entdeckung des Geistes*, pp. 1-22; B. Snell, 'φρένες—φρόνησις', *Glotta* 55, 1977, 34-64. Further references are to be found in the works cited.

---

[233] I do not wish to participate here in the discussion to what extent the φρένες are a location in the physical sense, an organ. Contrasting views are found in the selection of works cited.

•*Doxography:* The ancient commentators are divided in their interpretation of this line. Σ. 101a (the second part, found in BD and V, III 56/7 Dr.), καὶ ἵνα ἐμπῆξαι τὰς χεῖρας τοῖς Αἰθίοψι καὶ καθίκοιτο τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν διὰ τοῦ πολεμεῖν, takes both χεῖρας and (ἐγχεσφόροις) Αἰθιόπεσσι with πάξαιθ', interpreting φρασὶ as having reference to the φρένες of the Ethiopians. This interpretation seems to neglect ἐπιμείξαις and fails to account for the middle voice πάξαιθ'. Σ. 101b (III 57 Dr.), ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φρενῶν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως δεκτέον τὸν λόγον, ἵν' ἑαυτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας πήξαιτο, πεπηγυίας παράσχοι ταῖς φρεσίν, ἵνα ὃ διανοηθῆι ταῖς φρεσίν, ὑπηρετῆι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν. ἐνίοτε γὰρ ἐπιθυμοῦμέν τι κατορθῶσαι, καὶ ἀσθενοῦμεν αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι μὴ ὑπηρετούμενοι ταῖς χερσίν. ὁ δὲ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐτράφη, ἵν' ὅπερ ἂν διανοηθῆι, δυνηθῆι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν κατεργάσασθαι, also takes χεῖρας with πάξαιθ', but does not include (ἐγχεσφόροις) Αἰθιόπεσσι in the construction. Moreover, φρασὶ is interpreted as having reference to the φρένες of the Achilles. However, I do not believe that 'fixing his hand in his φρένες' could mean 'accomplishing with his hands what he figured out in his φρένες'. A third scholion, Σ. 108 (III 57 Dr., only found in V), παγίως[234] λογίσαιτο καὶ κρίνοι· ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς πέρας ἄγοι, appears to be a paraphrase of ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' only, not taking χεῖρας as its object.

Modern critics, on the other hand, who accept the text as it stands, are almost unanimous in their interpretation of this line: "dass er es sich fest ins Herz einpräge—d.h. es sich steif und fest in den Kopf setze," Mezger *ad loc.* (p. 389); "that he might keep it fixed in his heart", LSJ *s.v.* πήγνυμι (IV); "would fix in his soul a firm purpose that their chieftain ... should never return again to his home," Bury *ad loc.* (p. 57); "and nail to his heart the resolve," Bowra (transl. p. 103); "might set it in his soul," Sandys (p. 341).

In Appendix A, note 4 (pp. 231/2), Bury formulates four problematic features of lines 61/2: First, "ἐπιμίξαις Αἰθιόπεσσι χεῖρας is a solecism. ἐπιμιγνύναι is used in this sense but not ἐπιμιγνύναι χεῖρας." Second, "the whole sentence may appear rather forced. ... We should rather expect the clause of purpose to cease at Δαρδάνων τε, and a new indicative clause, stating what Achilles did or resolved, to begin at καὶ ἐγχεσφόροις ἐπιμίξαις." Third, the expression ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' ὅπως "excites suspicion, because no parallel can be adduced." Fourth, "in the extant works of Pindar there is no other case of ὅπως or ὅπως μὴ in a final clause." Bury himself states that none of these objections is conclusive, so as to question the text, and he answers to his second objection that "the strange form of expression is designedly chosen to emphasize the attribution of the Fourth Virtue (φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον, line 75) to Achilles." As to his first and third objection, a solecism is not problematic in itself and both expressions can be explained, as I have tried to do above. For ὅπως, see my note below.

---

[234] V reads πλαγίως. Abel suggested the insertion of μὴ before πλαγίως. Bury's emendation παγίως is certainly correct.

The text has been questioned by some critics. First, the expression πάξαιθ', ὅπως μή excited suspicion. Bergk conjectured πάξαι θάπος, σφίσι, assuming θάπος to be a Pindaric form of the Homeric τάφος, and to bear here the sense of 'fear' (cf. θάπαν· φόβον, Hesychius). R.J. Shackle, 'Pindar, Nem. III. 59-63', *CR* 35, 1921, 28/9, sharing Bury's objections to ὅπως, conjectured ἐπιμίξαι ... φρασὶ πλάξαι θ', ὃ δ' ὡς σφίσι, "'that he might abide the Lycians' war-whoop, fight hand to hand with the Ethiop spearmen, and smite them to the midriff; but that that other, their leader Memnon, might never return again to his home'—the ὃ δ' ὡς clause being co-ordinated with the ὄφρα clause above." Second, χεῖρας has been assumed to be corrupt. Bergk suggested Αἰθιόπεσσ', ἀθῆρας. Schmid and Jacobs conjectured κῆρας. R.J. Walker, 'Pindar, Nemean III 62', *AJPh* 19, 1898, 315/6, suggested πεῖρας, based on the third scholion quoted above, and translates: "And that, having come hand to hand with the Ethiopian spearsman, he might fix his hart on the execution of his intent."

For the uncertainty in the mss. between φρασὶ and φρεσὶ, see Braswell on *P.*4.219, with further references.

62. ὅπως

The clause introduced by ὅπως formulates the substance of Achilles' firm determination. Though there is no exact Pindaric parallel, the use of ὅπως after verbs referring to acts like deliberating, taking care, and the like, is not uncommon.

Cf. ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα, *Il.*4.14; cf. also *Il.*9.251, *Od.*13.376, 386, 19.557, 20.29, 39, etc. With a subjunctive: αὐτοὶ δὲ φραζώμεθ', ὅπως ὄχ' ἄριστα γένηται, *Od.*13.365; cf. also *Il.*3.110, 10.225, *Od.*1.77, S.*OT* 1367, etc. With an (oblique) optative: μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη, | ὅππως ἐξαπάφοιτο Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο, *Il.*14.159/60; οὐδέ τι οἶδε νοῆσαι ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω, | ὅππως οἱ παρὰ νηυσὶ σόοι μαχέονται Ἀχαιοί, *Il.*1.343/4; cf. also *Od.*9.554, S.*Ant.*271, Lys.6.39, etc.

There is one occurrence of ὅπως in Pindar bearing some resemblance with *h.l.*: τὸ δὲ σαφανὲς ἰὼν πόρσω κατέφρασεν (*sc.* Χρόνος), | ὁπᾶι τὰν πολέμοιο δόσιν | ἀκρόθινα διελὼν ἔθυε καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ὅπως ἄρα | ἔστασεν ἑορτὰν σὺν Ὀλυμπιάδι πρώται | νικαφορίαισί τε, *O.*10.55-9, where it operates at the same level as ὁπᾶι and introduces a clause formulating the content of κατέφρασεν. Cf. also οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως τὰ θεῶν | βουλεύματ' ἐρευνάσει βροτέαι φρενί, *fr.*61.3/4; ἔλαμψαν δ' ἀελίου δέμας ὅπω[ς] | ἀγλαὸν ἐς φάος ἰόντες δίδυμοι | παῖδες, *Pae.*12.14/5.

62-63. Achilles slaying Memnon. Mythological background

Memnon, son of Tithonus and Dawn,[235] came with a force of Ethiopians to Troy against the Greeks. He was slain by Achilles.

---

[235] Cf. *Od.*4.188, *h.Ven.*218 ff., Apollod.3.12.4, *Epit.*5.3, Tz.*Lycophr.*18; Σ.*ad Il.*11.1, Prop.2.18.7-18. Cf. also *Il.*11.1/2, *Od.*5.1/2.

This happened just before Achilles himself was shot with an arrow in the ankle by Paris and Apollo at the Scaean gate.[236]

The way in which this event is related here bears close resemblance to πέταται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάccac τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν (*sc.* Αἰακίδων)· καὶ ἐc Αἰθίοπαc | Μέμνονοc οὐκ {ἂν} ἀπονοcτήcαντοc ἔπαλτο· βαρὺ δέ cφιν | νεῖκοc 'Αχιλλεὺc | ἔμπεcε χαμαὶ καταβαὶc ἀφ' ἁρμάτων, | φαεννᾶc υἱὸν εὖτ' ἐνάριξεν 'Αόοc ἀκμᾶι | ἔγχεοc ζακότοιο, *N.*6.48-53.

Cf. also (Achilles), ὃc Ἕκτορα cφᾶλε, Τροίαc | ἄμαχον ἀcτραβῆ κίονα, Κύκνον τε θανάτωι πόρεν, | 'Αοῦc τε παῖδ' Αἰθίοπα, *O.*2.81/3[237]; λέγε, τίνεc Κύκνον, τίνεc Ἕκτορα πέφνον, | καὶ cτράταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον | Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν, *I.*5.39-41; Μέμνονόc τε βίαν | ὑπέρθυμον Ἕκτορά τ' ἄλλουc τ' ἀριcτέαc· οἷc δῶμα Φερcεφόναc | μανύων 'Αχιλεύc κτλ, *I.*8.54/5. These events were narrated in the *Aethiopis* of Arctinus. Cf. also Q.S.*Posthom.*2.100 ff., 235 ff., 452 ff., Tz.*Posthom.*234 ff., Dictys Cretensis, *Bellum Triianum* 4.6. Aeschylus wrote a tragedy on the subject called *Psychostasia* (cf. Plut.*Aud.Poet.*2, Σ.*ad Il.*8.70). Sophocles' *Ethiopians* may have delt with the same theme. Cf. also Paus.3.18.12, 5.19.1, 5.22.2. The slaying of Antilochus by Memnon is mentioned in *Od.*4.187/8 and related in detail in *P.*6.30-43. In *Od.*11.522 Memnon is regarded as the most beautiful man on earth. For the Ethiopians being the ἔcχατοι ἄνδρεc, and the implication of that for Achilles' fame, see my note on line 64 below (pp. 369/70).

62. κοίρανοc

This noun, meaning 'king, ruler,' occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar, but cf. οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷc κοίρανοc ἔcτω, | εἷc βαcιλεύc, *Il.*2.204/5; ἡγεμόνεc Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι, *Il.*2.487; *Il.*7.234, *Od.*18.106/7, A.*Ag.*549, S.*OC* 1287, E.*Med.*71/2, etc. The verb κοιρανέω, 'rule, command,' occurs in *Il.*2.207, *Il.*4.250, *Il.*5.824, 332, *Od.*1.247, etc. It is used metaphorically, probably in the sense 'arrange, organize,' in οὐδὲ γὰρ θεοὶ cεμνᾶν Χαρίτων ἄτερ | κοιρανέοντι χοροὺc οὔτε δαῖταc, *O.*14.8/9.

In *P.*6.30/1, Memnon is called ἐναρίμβροτον | ... cτράταρχον Αἰθιόπων. In *I.*5.40/1, he is the cτράταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον | ... χαλκοάραν.

62-63. ὀπίcω | πάλιν οἴκαδ'

The death of Memnon is alluded to by his not coming back home again,[238] which is not stated as a historical fact but presented as a

[236] Cf. Apollod.*Epitom.*5.3.

[237] It occured to me that the specific wording in the famous break-off formula following these lines (πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνοc ὠκέα βέλη) might possibly be prompted by the fact that the story that is broken off continues with an arrow shot in Achilles' ankle.

[238] For a possible explanation of the relevance of this, see my note on line 64 below.

firm determination on Achilles' part, which in turn is said to be one of the aims of Chiron's education. See my interpretation, pp. 228-31. ὀπίϲω is a local qualification ('back'), πάλιν is temporal ('again'), and οἴκαδ' specifies ὀπίϲω.[239]

63. ἀνεψιὸϲ ... Ἑλένοιο

Memnon is Helenus' cousin,[240] since Priam, the father of Helenus, and Tithonus, the father of Memnon, were brothers.[241] It is not clear why Memnon's relationship with Helenus is mentioned here. Helenus was the Trojan seer (cf. *Il.*6.76, etc.), but this fact seems to be irrelevant in the context (cf. interpretation, p. 230).

63. ζαμενήϲ

The adjective ζαμενήϲ means 'very fierce, very strong,' associating the person (or thing) it qualifies with a great amount of μένοϲ, 'strength, force, energy, courage.' Braswell, *Glotta* 57, 1979, 182-190, challanges the interpretation 'inspired,' i.e., associated with the power of prophecy, almost generally adopted for *P.*4.10, 9.38, *fr.*156.1 (cited below), and *h.l.*, by scholars from Fennell, Mezger and Gildersleeve up to and including Slater in his lexicon,[242] and shows that the adjective has only one meaning. As for *h.l.*, the interpretation of ζαμενήϲ as 'inspired' has been defended on the bases of the fact that Memnon is presented as the cousin of Helenus, the Trojan seer. Braswell (*op. cit.*, p. 190 with note 27) rightly remarks that "it would be ridiculous to suggest that such kinship with a seer makes a person one himself" and that the qualification 'very fierce, very strong' is "a thoroughly appropriate epithet for a great hero," especially in the context of a battlefield. Emphasis on the qualities of Achilles' subdued opponent adds to Achilles' glory.[243]

The adjective occurs in seven other places in Pindar: καὶ τὸ Μηδείαϲ ἔποϲ ἀγκομίϲαι | ἑβδόμαι καὶ ϲὺν δεκάται γενεᾶι Θήραιον, Αἰήτα τό ποτε ζαμενὴϲ | παῖϲ ἀπέπνευϲ' ἀθανάτου ϲτόματοϲ, δέϲποινα Κόλχων, *P.*4.9-11, "Pindar has given Medea an epithet which appropriately characterizes her actions in the narrative that follows. She shows 'great spirit' in helping Iason through his trials and in joining the Argonauts ϲὺν αὐτᾶι (v. 250) for the

[239] For ὀπίϲ(ϲ)ω, cf. *N.*11.32, *Pae.*6.101. For πάλιν, cf. *O.*1.65, *N.*10.73, *fr.*133.3, *O.*10.87. For οἴκαδε, cf. *O.*6.99, *O.*7.4, *P.*4.106, *N.*4.76.

[240] For the noun, cf. ταχέωϲ δ' Ἄδματοϲ ἷκεν καὶ Μέλαμποϲ | εὐμενέοντεϲ ἀνεψιόν, *P.*4.126/7, i.e. Jason. Cf. also *Il.*9.464, Hdt.5.30, 7.82, A.*Pr.*856, Is.11.2, etc.

[241] Cf. Λαομέδων δ' ἄρα Τιθωνὸν τέκετο Πρίαμόν τε, *Il.*20.237, etc.

[242] For a complete doxography, see Braswell, *op. cit.*, p. 182 with n. 2. It may be noted that the idea of one adjective having two completely different 'meanings' is not entirely felicitous from a semantical point of view.

[243] Thus also Instone, *Selected Odes*, p. 165.

dangerous voyage back to Greece," Braswell, *op. cit.*, p. 187, cf. also Σ.*ad loc.* (17a, II 99 Dr.); τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανᾶι χλαορὸν γελάccαιc ὀφρύϊ, μῆτιν ἐὰν | εὐθὺc ἀμείβετο, *P.*9.38/9, "the Centaurs were traditionally fierce and ζαμενήc characterizes Chiron insofar as he is a member of that race," *ibid.* p. 189; ὁ ζαμενὴc δ' ὁ χοροιτύπος, ὃν Μαλέαc ὄροc ἔθρεψε, Ναΐδοc ἀκοίταc | Cιληνόc, *fr.*156; εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτοc ἁλίωι | còc πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο, *N.*4.13/4 (cf. ὁρᾶι φάοc ἠελίοιο, *Il.*18.61, etc. and μένοc ἠελίοιο, *Il.*23.190); ἄνεμοc ζαμενήc, *Pae.*8.64; τόλμα τέ μιν ζαμενὴc καὶ cύνεcιc πρόcκοποc ἐcάωcεν, *fr.*231; *fr.*169.35. Cf. also *h.Merc.*307, S.*Aj.*137, A.R.1.1029, Nic.*Ther.*181, Opp.*Hal.*1.369, 561, 2.226, 242, 469, *Cyn.*3.448, Nonn.*D.*21.33, 30.209, etc.

Strophe Δ

64. τηλαυγὲc ἄραρε φέγγοc Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν

'From here[244] the far shining light of the Aeacids is firmly fixed.' It is not immediately clear what location **αὐτόθεν** refers to. There are three possibilities: it refers to the location last mentioned explicitly, i.e., Troy,[245] or to the location last alluded to (by means of οἴκαδ' in the preceding line), i.e., Ethiopia, or to the location that is called 'here' in the pragmatic context of the performance of the ode, i.e., Aegina.[246] There are no formal objections against either of these identifications. The third possibility, however, gives the best sense. If αὐτόθεν refers to Aegina, the Aeacids' place of origin ('a world-wide impact has the fame of the Aecads, finding its origin here on Aegina'), the fact that their 'light' is 'shining far' is perfectly illustrated by the preceding lines, since their fame has not only reached Troy, but went even as far as Ethiopia, as is implied in lines 62/3.[247] Due to Achilles the Ethiopians lost their king. The Ethiopians were confronted with the qualities of the Aeacids, as represented by Achilles. Thus the fame of the Aeacids reached even Ethiopia, which is as far as it can possibly reach, for the Ethiopians are the ἔcχατοι ἄνδρεc,[248] which gives τηλαυγέc is full poignancy. Line 64 closes off the narra-

---

[244] I am not convinced that αὐτόθεν can mean 'from themselves,' 'from their own resources,' as Instone (*Selected Odes*, pp. 79, 165) suggests.

[245] Thus Slater *s.v.* αὐτόθεν.

[246] Thus Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, p. 55 (313), n. 2.

[247] Αὐτόθεν is deictic also at *N.*5.20, the only other Pindaric occurrence of the adverb. See my note *ad loc.*

[248] Cf. νῦν δὲ πρὸc ἐcχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖcιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέοc cταλᾶν, *O.*3.43/4, where οἴκοθεν, like αὐτόθεν here, must refer to the origin of the fame, Theron's home in this case. The opposition οἴκοθεν ~ Pillars of Heracles visualizes the world-wide impact of Theron's fame, as does the opposition αὐτόθεν ~ Ethiopia here.

tive, presenting the relevance of the related past in the light of the present. In the next line a new episode starts, with an asyndetic invocation of Zeus (see next note).[249]

Of the verb **ἄραρε** only the perfect tense (and the substantivated form ἄρμενα, in the sense 'what is appropriate', *O.*8.73, line 58 above) is attested in Pindar. It occurs four times, including *h.l.* Literally it means 'to be fixed'. Pindar uses it however exclusively in a metaphorical way. Cf. *I.*2.19/20, *O.*10.80-3, *N.*5.44. See further my note on *N.*5.44, pp. 173/4. The use of ἄραρε here has in common with *N.*5.44 that no grammatical complement to ἄραρε can be found. But, on the other hand, we have the possibility of interpreting αὐτόθεν as representing such an indirect object and as referring to the notion to which the 'far shining light of the Aeacids' is firmly related by means of ἄραρε, which makes this instance comparable to *I.*2.19/20 and *O.*10.80-3. The verb may evoke associations of the the fame being stable, not easily broken down.

τηλαυγές: The Ethiopians are the ἔcχατοι ἀνδρῶν (*Od.*1.23) and τῆλοθ' ἐόντεc (*Od.*1.22). They are believed to live at the shores of the Oceanus (cf. *Il.*23.206, *Od.*1.24). In *N.*6.48-53, the fact that Achilles killed their king is explicitly associated with the idea that, as a consequence, the fame of the Aeacids has reached even the remotest areas of the world.

In *I.*6.19-27, the poet formulates his obligation to praise Aeginetan heroes when he is on Aegina explicitly, emphasizing the plentiful availability of good stories about the Aeacids, and stressing the world-wide impact of their fame. In *P.*2.6, cτέφανοι, as a symbol of victory, glory and fame, are called τηλαυγεῖc, 'shining far' and therefore 'visible' from a great distance. In ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόcωπον | χρὴ θέμεν τηλαυγέc, *O.*6.3/4, τηλαυγέc qualifies the façade of a building, which has to catch one's eye from a great distance, and likewise the prooimion of an ode, which is compared to a façade. Cf. also *P.*3.75, *Pae.*7.12, *h.Hom.*31.13, 32.8, Thgn.550, B.16.5, S.*Tr.*524, etc.

• *Light as a metaphor for fame:* The opposition light *vs.* darkness runs as a *Leitmotiv* through this ode. Cf. line 41 above and 83/4 below. See further interpretation, pp. 217, 220 n. 47, 223. Pindar frequently uses words denoting light or brightness as metaphors for fame. The idea behind most of these passages is that someone's (or something's)

---

[249] Suzanne Fleischman, *Tense and Narrativity*, pp. 138/9, uses the term 'Coda' for this, defining it as "a device for returning the verbal perspective to the time frame of speaker now. As a rule, the sequence of events reported in a narrative does not extend up to actual present time. By means of a Coda the narrator can bridge the gap between the end of the story and the present." Her remark that "the Coda's function of connecting past events to the speaker-now explains the high frequency in Codas of the (present) perfect—traditionally defined as a past with 'present relevance'" (p. 139) is interesting.

being widely known is described in visual terms, i.e., in terms of his (or its) being 'visible' everywhere. In λάμπει δὲ cαφὴc ἀρετὰ | ἔν τε γυμνοῖcι cταδίοιc cφίcιν ἔν τ' ἀcπιδοδούποιcιν ὁπλίταιc δρόμοιc, κτλ, *I.*1.21/2, the qualification cαφήc (21) activates connotations of the victors' ἀρετά being clearly 'visible'. Likewise, in ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν | μαλεραῖc ἐπιφλέγων ἀοιδαῖc, | καὶ ἀγάνοροc ἵππου | θᾶccον καὶ ναὸc ὑποπτέρου παντᾶι | ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν, *O.*9.21-5, the combination of the light metaphor and the promise to send the song to every corner of the world seems to activate connotations of the city being 'visible' everywhere; the poet 'sheds light' upon the victor's city by means of his song, since his song of praise is (presented as) a guarantee for the fame of the victor and, consequently, of his hometown. In ἀλλ' Ὅμηρόc τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὃc αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Αἴαντοc) | πᾶcαν ὀρθώcαιc ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφραcεν | θεcπεcίων ἐπέων λοιποῖc ἀθύρειν. | τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει, | εἴ τιc εὖ εἴπηι τι· καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν | ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶc καλῶν ἄcβεcτοc αἰεί. | προφρόνων Μοιcᾶν τύχοιμεν, κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρcὸν ὕμνων | καὶ Μελίccωι, *I.*4.37-44, the merit of Homer's poetry with respect to Ajax' fame—and of poetry in general with respect to anyone's fame—is formulated in terms of an 'unquenchable sunbeam of ἔργματα καλά' (42); likewise, Pindar wants to 'light a torch of song' for the victor.[250] In λάμπει δέ οἱ (*sc.* Ἱέρωνι) κλέοc | ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοποc ἀποικίαι, *O.*1.23/4, the victor's κλέοc 'shines' at place of his victory. In *I.*2.17, the Acragantinian victor Xenocrates is called Ἀκραγαντίνων φάοc, because his victory adds to the glory (and, therefore, to the 'visibility') of his fellow-citizens. Cf. also τὸ δὲ κλέοc | τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοιc | Πέλοποc, *O.*1.93/4; Ἀλεξιβιάδα, cὲ δ' ἠΰκομοι φλέγοντι Χάριτεc[251], *P.*5.45; Οὐλυμπιονίκαν | δέξαι Χαρίτων γ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον, | χρονιώτατον φάοc εὐρυcθενέων ἀρετᾶν, *O.*4.8-10; τῶν εὐφροcύνα τε καὶ δόξ' ἐπιφλέγει, *P.*11.45, of the victor and his father; ἄπονον δ' ἔλαβον χάρμα παῦροί τινεc, | ἔργων πρὸ πάντων βιότωι φάοc, *O.*10.22/3. Cf. also *P.*2.6 (*v.s.*), *P.*8.96, *I.*4.23, *N.*9.41/2, *Pae.*18.5, B.13.175-81, etc.

As a contrast, darkness is a symbol for a life without fame, either because successes deserving to be praised are lacking, as in τά κέ τιc ἀνώνυμον | γῆραc ἐν cκότωι καθήμενοc ἕψοι μάταν, | ἀπάντων καλῶν ἄμμοροc, *O.*1.82-4, or because the successes are not illuminated by song, as in ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ | cκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, *N.*7.12/3. Likewise, in *N.*7.61 ψόγοc, 'fault-finding', as opposed to κλέοc ἐτήτυμον (63), is meta-

---

[250] Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon*, pp. 55/6, explains the image of the torch by submitting the hypothesis that the celebration for Melissus, of which *I.*4 was a part, took place at night, connecting this with specific kinds of initiation rituals.

[251] One of the Graces bears the name Ἀγλαΐα (*O.*14.13).

phorically qualified as cκοτεινόν, since ψόγοc results in the opposite of κλέοc. For this idea cf. especially *N.*4.36-41. Cf. also *fr.*42, 228. See further my note on ψεφηνόc, line 41 (pp. 330/1).

• *Literature:* On light as a metaphor, see further: Bowra, *Pindar*, pp. 245-55; D. Bremer, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Bonn 1976; R. Bultmann, 'Zur Geschichte der Lichtsymbolik im Altertum', *Philologus* 97, 1948, 1-36; M.G. Ciani, *Φάοc e termini affini nella poesia greca*, Firenze 1974, *passim*, esp. pp. 135-47; M. Detienne, *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce anchaïque*, Paris 1967, 22/3; J. Duchemin, 'Essai sur le symbolisme Pindarique: or, lumière et couleurs', *REG* 65, 1952, 46-58; J. Duchemin, *Pindare poète et prophète*, pp. 194-228; Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, 11-29; E. Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon*, pp. 55/6, 81/2, 213-5; C. Mugler, 'La lumière et la vision dans la poésie grecque', *REG* 73, 1960, 40-72; Steiner, *Crown of Song*, pp. 46-8, 116/7, 128, 133/4, 150, 152; D. Tarrant, 'Greek Metaphors of Light', *CQ* 10, 1960, 181-187; M. Treu, 'Licht und Leuchtendes in der archaischen griechischen Poesie', *Studium Generale* 18, 1965, 83-97. For light-imagery in Bacchylides see especially H. Kriegler, *Untersuchungen zu den optischen und akustischen Daten der bacchylideischen Dichtung*, Diss. Wien 1969, 61-131.

65-70

Zeus,—for it is your blood and yours are the Games, which the hymn has struck with voices of youths celebrating domestic delight. The clamour is right for Aristoclidas who carries a victory and who has added this island to words of glory and to brilliant concerns the holy Thearion of the Pythian.

65. Ζεῦ, τέον γὰρ αἷμα, cέο δ' ἀγών

Zeus, as Aeacus' father, is the primogenitor of the Aeacids and of all Aeginetans claiming their descent from them, including, without doubt, the present victor (see also *N.*5.8 and 43 with my notes, pp. 109, 610). And the Nemean Games were held in honour of Zeus (cf. *N.*2.4/5, *N.*7.80-2, *I.*6.3/4, *N.*4.9-11, *O.*8.16, etc.). The preceding phrase closes the narrative, presenting the relevance of the related past in the light of the present; now a new section begins, with an invocation of Zeus.[252] This accounts for the asyndeton, since a fresh start is a situation in which the need to define any further the relation to the preceding context does not arise.[253] **γάρ** signals that both statements, τέον αἷμα and cέο ἀγών, supply information in answer to the question as to the motives for invoking Zeus.

For **αἷμα** used metaphorically for 'stock, line, child,' cf. τετράτων παίδων κ' ἐπιγεινομένων | αἱμά οἱ κείναν λάβε cὺν Δαναοῖc εὐρεῖαν ἄπειρον,

---

[252] It is preferable to print a full stop after line 64, instead of the point above the line printed by Snell-Maehler.

[253] Cf. my note on line 53 above (p. 353). See also Sicking, *Particle Usage*, pp. 40-4.

*P.*4.47/8, with reference to the children of the fourth generation; αἷμα πάτρας, *N.*6.35b; συμβαλεῖν μὰν εὐμαρὲς ἦν τό τε Πεισάνδρου πάλαι | αἷμ' ἀπὸ Σπάρτας, *N.*11.33/4. Cf. also *Il.*6.211, 19.105, 111, *Od.*4.611, 7.583, 16.300, etc. Note the avoidance of *concinnitas*, the variation of the possessive and personal pronoun. See introduction pp. 51/2 above.

65. τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν

The **ὕμνος** is the hymn presently sung. The hymn has 'struck' Zeus' Games, since its subject matter is a victory won at the Nemean Games. Heath and Lefkowitz, *CPh* 86, 1991, 173-191, defend their solo-hypothesis[254], which appears to be challenged gravely by the explicit reference to choral performance in line 66, by taking ὕμνος as referring to a song sung by a κῶμος on some past occasion, either on the site of the victory or on Aegina. "The tense (**ἔβαλεν**) offers some support for a past occasion, since Pindar's odes normally refer to themselves in the present or future; the aorist, as one would expect, is rare (Slater, *CQ* 19, 1969, 88 n. 1, cites only *O.*10.100 [αἴνησα]; at the very end of the song the aorist is perhaps less surprising)" (p. 188). As Carey, *CPh* 86, 1991, 192-200, rightly observes, τεὸν ... αἷμα looks back to the praise of the Aeacids in 33-64 and the addition σέο δ' ἀγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν refers too to what precedes, especially 15-18. Moreover, "it is difficult to believe that without any hint Pindar has changed direction in mid-sentence to mention some other song, evidently identical in theme with *N.*3" (p. 197).

For 'metanarrative' first person utterances with reference to what has preceded in the course of the performance, the following examples may be adduced: ἐγὼ δὲ συνεφαπτόμενος σπουδᾶι, κλυτὸν ἔθνος | Λοκρῶν ἀμφέπεσον, μελίτι | εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβρέχων· παῖδ' ἐρατὸν ⟨δ'⟩ Ἀρχεστάτου | αἴνησα, *O.*10.97-100, where for both first person verbs past tenses (aorists) are used, because they contain a reference backward to the ode as a whole; ἄπιστον ἔειπ', *N.*9.33, referring to what just preceded. In ἦρ', ὦ φίλοι, κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάνθην, | ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰὼν τὸ πρίν· ἤ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου | ἔβαλεν, κτλ, *P.*11.38-40, both past tenses (aorists) refer to the story that has just preceded (31-7), being now, in retrospective, characterized as an unfelicitous digression, while τὸ πρίν refers to the moment before this, when lines 1-30 were performed. Somewhat more complex is πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλών, *N.*1.18, which may refer to the praise of Sicily in the preceding lines ("ἐπέβαν refers the journey of song, a journey begun in vv. 4 f.", Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 109"); another possibility may be that the moment referred to by means of the past tense (aorist) is the moment when Pindar accepted the commission of writing this ode. Even more complex is νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν

---

[254] See my general note on the proem above, and my notes on 10-3 above (pp. 242, 267/8).

ἀερθεὶϲ ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχὺϲ εἰμι καταθέμεν, *N.*7.75/6, where the past tense may refer to the unfavourable presentation of Neoptolemos on a former occasion in Delphi, in a poem now known as *Pae.*6, or, perhaps, to passages which have preceded in which Pindar has dealt with themes not directly related to Sogenes' victory. Similar metanarrative past references to the first person are to be found in historiographical narrative prose. Cf. e.g. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπείπερ ἠρξάμην, διατελέϲαι βούλομαι τὰ περὶ Εὔφρονοϲ, X.*HG* 7.3.4. See also my *First Person Futures in Pindar* (forthcoming).

•*Imagery:* The verb ἔβαλεν, borrowed from 'ballistic' terminology, is used metaphorically in a poetical context. Similar metaphors are not uncommon in the works of Pindar. Though emphasis may vary, Pindar is rather consistent with respect to his usage of archery-metaphors. The person or thing that the poet 'aims at' is the person or thing that he choses as his subject matter. When the poet 'hits' his subject matter, he presents it in exactly the right way.[255] The 'arrows' are the words, i.e., the means the poet has at his disposal to accomplish his aims.

One of the most illustrative examples is the image of words, like arrows, hitting the bull's eye: ἔλπομαι | μέγα εἰπὼν ϲκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν | ὥτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἱείϲ, *N.*6.26-8, following the pretentious statement directly preceding (24-6), that no family has won more victories than the one of the victor presently celebrated. The *tenor* of the imagary is that the poet, although he has made a highly pretentious statement, hopes that he has said the truth exactly. In πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνοϲ ὠκέα βέλη | ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτραϲ | φωνάεντα ϲυνετοῖϲιν ... ἔπεχε νῦν ϲκοπῶι τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶϲ αὖτε φρενὸϲ εὐκλέαϲ ὀϊϲτοὺϲ ἱέντεϲ; ἐπί τοι | Ἀκράγαντι τανύϲαιϲ | αὐδάϲομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόωι, *O.*2.83-92, the ballistic imagery is maintained throughout the entire passage (cf. my *CPh* 89, 1994, 311-3). The βέλη in line 83 are the means Pindar has at his disposal to accomplish his aims, the words (as appears from the attributive qualification in line 85). The question 'at whom shall I shoot?' (i.e., 'about whom shall I sing?') in lines 89/90 is answered in the sequel.[256] *O.*2.83/4 are comparable to πολλὰ μὲν ἀρτιεπὴϲ | γλῶϲϲά μοι τοξεύματ' ἔχει περὶ κείνων | κελαδέϲαι, *I.*5.46-8, where the emphasis is also on the plentiful availability of means for the poet to accomplish his aims. Cf. further: ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν | Μοῖϲα καρτερώτατον βέλοϲ ἀλκᾶι τρέφει, *O.*1.111/2 (with Gerber *ad loc.*); οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θραϲύβουλε, φῶτεϲ, οἳ χρυϲαμπύκων | ἐϲ δίφρον Μοιϲᾶν ἔβαινον

---

[255] Simpson, *TAPhA* 100, 1969, p. 471, connects the ballistic metaphor with the ideal of speaking κατὰ καιρόν. Cf. also Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, p. 153: "the bow- and jevelin-metaphors parallel the poet's precision and sense of quantitative measure with the athlete's."

[256] Both qualifications in line 90, ἐκ μαλθακᾶϲ φρενόϲ and εὐκλέαϲ, 'soften' the metaphor: belonging to the terminology of the *tenor*, they guide the hearer towards the intended interpretation of the *vehicles*.

κλυτᾶι φόρμιγγι cυναντόμενοι, | ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους, | ὅcτις ἐὼν καλὸc εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας | εὐθρόνου μνάcτειραν ἁδίcταν ὀπώραν, *I.*2.1-5; πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ θεύδει βαλών, *N.*1.18. For *O.*9.5-12 see my note on *P.*8.61 (pp. 550/1). The image of the javelin is used in a similar way, cf. *O.*13.93-5, *P.*1.43-5, *N.*1.18, *N.*7.66, *N.*9.55, *I.*2.35. Other authors: B.10.43, A.*Ag.*241, *Eu.*676, *Suppl.*446, Pl.*Tht.*180a; *quid brevi fortes iaculamur aevo multa*, Hor.*C.*2.16.17, etc. The negative counterpart of words that 'hit the mark,' words that are χαμαιπετέες, is to be found in *P.*6.37.

• *Literature:* On ballistic imagery see further: Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, p. 58; Duchemin, *Poète et prophète*, p. 25; M. Durante, in: *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* (ed. R. Schmitt), Darmstadt 1968, pp. 247-50; Gianotti, *Poetica pindarica*, pp. 67/8; Heyne *ad O.*1, colon 179; Hoey, *HSCPh* 70, 1965, p. 261, n. 59; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, pp. 152/3; Van Leeuwen, *Tweede Olympische*, I pp. 225/6, 254/5; Simpson, 'The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes', *TAPhA* 100, 1969, 437-73; Steiner, *Crown of Song*, pp. 41, 78, 108, 113/4, 117, 152. For words as missiles in other poets, see T.L.F. Tafel, *Dilucidationum Pindaricarum volumina duo*, I: *Olympia et Pythia*, Berolini 1827, pp. 68/9; Kamerbeek on S.*OT* 784.

66. ὀπὶ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων

'By means of the voices of youths celebrating domestic joy.' ὀπὶ νέων refers to the chorus singing this ode (see preceding note). χάρμα is 'what causes joy,' referring the victory that is presently celebrated. The χάρμα is ἐπιχώριον from the perspective of the audience. The adjective stresses the link between the individual victory and the good for the entire community.

For **χάρμα** explicitly referring to the joy that is a result of victory, cf. χάρμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέροc, *P.*1.59; *P.*8.64-6, *I.*5.53/4; cf. also *O.*10.22. For χάρμα in different contexts, cf. *O.*2.19, 99, *O.*7.44, *P.*9.64, *N.*7.88, *fr.*225. See also my notes on χαρίεντα, line 12 above (p. 619), and on *N.*5.54 Χάριccιν (p. 193). For song itself being the subject of **κελαδέω** cf. κελαδέοντι μὲν ἀμφὶ Κινύραν πολλάκιc | φᾶμαι Κυπρίων, *P.*2.15/6. For ***ὄψ**, see my note on line 5 above (p. 250). For **ἐπιχώριον** see my note on *N.*5.44 (p. 175). For **νέων** cf. νεανίαι, line 5 above with my note (pp. 248/9).

67. βοὰ δὲ νικαφόρωι cὺν Ἀριcτοκλείδαι πρέπει

βοά[257] is the 'sound' referred to in the preceding line, i.e., to the victory ode being presently sung by a chorus of youths. cὺν ... πρέπει is

---

[257] The scholiast *ad h.l.* (117a, III 58 Dr.) mentions an alternative reading βοᾶι (ἔν τιcι δὲ γράφεται cὺν τῶι ι βοᾶι, προcληψόμεθα δὲ ἔξωθεν τὴν cύν πρόθεcιν, ἵν' ἧι· cὺν βοᾶι νέων ὁ ὕμνοc ἐκπρεπήc ἐcτιν). To my mind, this reading would rather result in 'it (the hymn) is fitting to the βοά as well as (cύν) to Aristoclides', which is unlikely, since ὕμνοc and βοά must refer to the same thing in reality.

generally taken to be *in tmesi*.[258] The verb ϲυμπρέπω occurs only here and in Plu.*Phil*.11 and Aristaenet.1.12. The adjective ϲυμπρεπήϲ occurs in A.*Th*.13 and *Suppl*.458. The idea that the audience are supposed to take ϲὺν with πρέπω instead of with the datives surrounding it, presupposes that they were so familiar with the compound verb that they would immediately recognize ϲύν as a part of the compound instead of a preposition. The fact that the verb ϲυμπρέπω is extremely rare does not seem to justify this presupposition. That πρέπω is nowhere else construed with a prepositional ϲύν-clause is, of course, the reason for interpretors to submit *tmesis*, but I doubt that this reason is decisive. A listening audience do not weigh out both possibilities against each other, as modern interpretors do. When a hearer has the possibility of construing a preposition with a noun phrase in a proper oblique case,[259] he will always do so—thoughts of *tmesis* not even crossing his mind—, unless in those situations in which a verb follows that does not occur as a *simplex*, or when the combination of the preposition and the verb results in such a familiar compound that this interpretation overrules the more obvious one. See also my note on *P*.8.68 (p. 558).

In Homer the verb **πρέπω** is used exclusively in the sense 'to be conspicuous', i.e., 'to stand out from a background.'[260] In later prose it has obtained a moral (and aesthetic) sense, 'to be fitting.' Pindar, as well as the tragic poets, exploits both usages of the verb.

For πρέπω, 'to be conspicuous,' i.e., 'to stand out from a background,' cf., e.g., πειρῶντι δὲ καὶ χρυϲὸϲ ἐν βαϲάνωι πρέπει | καὶ νόοϲ ὀρθόϲ, *P*.10.67/8; ὃ δ' ἔπρεπε καὶ διὰ πάντων, *Il*.12.104; οἳ δέ τ' ἐϲ αὐτὸν | τερπόμενοι λεύϲϲουϲιν, ὃ δ' ἀϲφαλέωϲ ἀγορεύει | αἰδοῖ μειλιχίηι, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοιϲιν, *Od*.8.170-2, cf. Hes.*Th*.92; τί χρῆμα λεύϲϲω; τίϲ ποθ' ἥδ' ὁμήγυριϲ | ϲτείχει γυναικῶν φάρεϲιν μελαγχίμοιϲ | πρέπουϲα; A.*Ch*.10-2; λαμπρὰ δὲ πανϲέληνοϲ ἐν μέϲωι ϲάκει, | πρέϲβιϲτον ἄϲτρων, νυκτὸϲ ὀφθαλμόϲ, πρέπει, A.*Th*.389/90; Ζεὺϲ πρέπων δι' αἰθέροϲ, E.*Hel*.216, etc. Cf. also ὁ δὲ χρυϲὸϲ αἰθόμενον πῦρ | ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνοροϲ ἔξοχα πλούτου, *O*.1.1/2; τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀνδράϲιν ἐμπρέπει, *P*.8.28, *sc*. Aegina (see my note, pp. 507/8); φυᾶι τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει | ἐκ πατέρων παιϲὶ λῆμα, *P*.8.44/5 (see my note, pp. 531/2), etc.

For πρέπω in this sense, used metaphorically, referring to sound cf. οἶμαι βοὴν ἄμεικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν, A.*Ag*.321. It is used metaphorically of smell in ὁμοῖοϲ ἀτμὸϲ ὥϲπερ ἐκ τάφου πρέπει, A.*Ag*.1311.

For πρέπω, 'to be fitting,' cf. θνατὰ θνατοῖϲι πρέπει, *I*.5.16; τοῖϲ δ' ὀλβίοιϲ γε καὶ τὸ νικᾶϲθαι πρέπει, A.*Ag*.941, etc. For impersonal πρέπει, 'it is

---

[258] Slater *s.v.*, LSJ *s.v.*, Mezger, Bury, Fennell.

[259] Contrast cases like: ἐν δ' ἀρετὰν | ἔβαλεν καὶ χάρματ' ἀνθρώποιϲι προμαθέοϲ αἰδώϲ, *O*.7.43/4.

[260] Thus Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.242.

fitting', cf. *O.*2.46, *P.*4.147, *P.*5.43, 104, *N.*7.82, *fr.*70a.11-3, *fr.*94b.33, *fr.*121. πρέπω in this sense is construed with ἐν in: τί φήϲομεν γάρ, εἰ πόλιϲ μὲν ἀξιοῖ | κίνδυνον ἡμῶν οὕνεκ' αἵρεϲθαι μέγαν, | αὐτοὶ δὲ προϲτιθέντεϲ ἄλλοιϲιν πόνουϲ, | παρόν ϲφε ϲῶιϲαι, φευξόμεϲθα μὴ θανεῖν; | οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεί τοι καὶ γέλωτοϲ ἄξια, | ϲτένειν μὲν ἱκέταϲ δαιμόνων καθημένουϲ, | πατρὸϲ δ' ἐκείνου φύνταϲ οὗ πεφύκαμεν | κακοὺϲ ὁρᾶϲθαι· ποῦ τάδ' ἐν χρηϲτοῖϲ πρέπει; E.*Heracl.*503-10; with εἰϲ in: προεῖπε δὲ νικητήρια καὶ ὅλαιϲ ταῖϲ τάξεϲι καὶ ὅλοιϲ τοῖϲ λόχοιϲ, καὶ ταῖϲ δεκάϲιν ὡϲαύτωϲ καὶ ταῖϲ πεμπάϲιν, αἳ ἂν φαίνωνται εὐπιϲτόταται τοῖϲ ἄρχουϲιν οὖϲαι καὶ προθυμότατα ἀϲκοῦϲαι τὰ προειρημένα. ἦν δὲ ταύταιϲ τὰ νικητήρια οἷα δὴ εἰϲ πλῆθοϲ πρέπει, X.*Cyr.*2.1.24.

The unusal construction of πρέπω with a ϲύν-clause results in a situation in which neither one of both senses of the verb can be excluded in favour of the other. First, the sentence lends itself to the interpretation: 'The clamour is right for Aristoclidas who carries a victory.' With this interpretation, the poet states explicitly that the victor deserves the ode he is getting.[261] Second, this line may be interpreted as: 'The clamour is conspicuous, and the victory-carrying Aristoclidas with it.' The assertion that the present ode is conspicuous, widely known, and that the victor celebrated by it, therefore, will be just as conspicuous and widely known, is, of course, congruent with the encomiastic aims of Pindar's poetry, and it provides a parallel to line 64. The unique coinage of πρέπει with a prepositional ϲύν-clause is motivated by exactly this ambiguity. The contruction with ϲύν, by the poet's design, does not resolve the ambivalence inherent to the verb πρέπει (as opposed to a dative without ϲύν on the one hand, and a nominative coordinated on a par with βοά on the other).

For a **ϲύν**-clause used in constructions where a bare dative would be more usual—to fit the first interpretation—, cf., e.g., ἔργοιϲ δὲ καλοῖϲ ἔϲοπτρον ἴϲαμεν ἑνὶ ϲὺν τρόπωι, | εἰ κτλ, *N.*7.14/5; ϲὺν πολέμωι κτηϲάμ[ενοι] χθόνα πολύδωρον, *Pae.*2.59/60; εἰ γάρ τιϲ ἐϲλὰ πέπαται μὴ ϲὺν μακρῶι πόνωι, *P.*8.74. Cf. also εἰ ϲύν τινι μοιριδίωι παλάμαι | ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον, *O.*9.25/6, on which Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 160, remarks that it "contient un substantif fréquent par ailleurs au datif pluriel non prépositionnel, tel θεῶν παλάμαιϲ, *P.*1.48." For ϲύν, 'along with', virtually equivalent to a constuction with καί or τε—to fit the second interpretation —, cf., e.g., ἀχεῖ τ' ὀμφαὶ μελέων ϲὺν αὐλοῖϲ, *fr.*75.18; ἔϲταϲεν ἑορτὰν ϲὺν 'Ολυμπιάδι πρώται | νικαφορίαιϲί τε, *O.*10.58/9; πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτωι ϲὺν ἐλευθερίαι | ... ἔκτιϲϲε, *P.*1.61/2. ϲύν is the preposition used most frequently by Pindar after ἐν. No other poet or prose author uses it as fre-

[261] For the 'χρέοϲ motif' see my note on *P.*8.33 (pp. 513-5).

quently as he does.[262] The reason for Pindar's penchant for this preposition may be that it is a conveniant device for relating two notions to one another without making the nature of this relation explicit, thus leaving it to the interpretation of the audience.

68. ὃϲ τάνδε νᾶϲον εὐκλέϊ προϲέθηκε λόγωι

'Who has added this island to the word of glory.' The εὐκλεήϲ[263] λόγοϲ refers to the praise Aristoclidas is getting as a result of his victory, specifically to the ode that is presently being sung. He has 'added' Aegina to this praise, since it shares in his glory. For the community as a whole being presented as profiting directly from a victory won by one of its members, see my note on *N.*5.8 (p. 110).

The formulation here involves an inversion of what we would expect. Instead of 'he has added glory to Aegina' we get 'he has added Aegina to glory.' Contrast: εἴη νιν εὐφώνων πτερύγεϲϲιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλααῖϲ | Πιερίδων, ἔτι καὶ Πυθῶθεν 'Ολυμπιάδων τ' ἐξαίρετοιϲ | 'Αλφεοῦ ἔρνεϲι φράξαι χεῖρα τιμὰν ἑπταπύλοιϲ | Θήβαιϲι τεύχοντ', *I.*1.64-7; εἴπερ καθ' ὁδόν νιν (*sc.* the victor) εὐθυπομπὸϲ | αἰὼν ταῖϲ μεγάλαιϲ δέδωκε κόϲμον 'Αθάναιϲ, *N.*2.7/8, etc. For similar reversals cf. ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρουϲ, *O.*1.53 (with Gerber *ad loc.*, p. 90); πλοῦτοϲ ὁ λαχὼν ποιμένα | ἐπακτὸν ἀλλότριον, *O.*10.88/9; "Ηραϲ ... τὰν Διὸϲ εὐναὶ λάχον | πολυγαθέεϲ, *P.*2.27/8; μία δ' οὐχ ἅπανταϲ ἄμμε θρέψει | μελέτα, *O.*9.106/7; νέμει γὰρ 'Ατρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν, *O.*10.13, etc.

The verb **προϲτίθημι**, 'add to,' occurs only once more in Pindar: ὑγίεντα δ' εἴ τιϲ ὄλβον ἄρδει, | ἐξαρκέων κτεάτεϲϲι καὶ εὐλογίαν προϲτιθείϲ, μὴ ματεύϲηι θεὸϲ γενέϲθαι, *O.*5.23/4, where κτεάτεϲϲι is to be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both ἐξαρκέων and προϲτιθείϲ. For the type of expression cf. e.g. καί νυν ἐν Πυθῶνί νιν (*sc.* πόλιν) ἀγαθέαι Καρνειάδα | υἱὸϲ εὐθαλεῖ ϲυνέμειξε τύχαι, *P.*9.71/2.

69-70. καὶ ϲεμνὸν ἀγλααῖϲι μερίμναιϲ | Πυθίου Θεάριον

'And (who has added) the sacred Thearion of the Pythian to his bright concerns.' Apparently, Aristoclidas was a member of the council of *thearoi.* The phrasing gives the impression of him having become a member as a result of his victory, because this phrase is so closely connected to the preceding one which formulates a direct effect of his victory. See interpretation, pp. 201/2, 218, 220, 227.

---

[262] See Mommsen, *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen*, Berlin 1895, pp. 561/2.

[263] The MSS. read εὐκλεεῖ against the metre. The correction originates from Moschopoulos. The same scribal error occurs in *O.*10.85 and *N.*2.24.

• *Syntax:* The verb προcέθηκε is to be supplied from the preceding line. Syntactically, cέμνον ... Πυθίου Θεάριον stands on a par with τάνδε νᾶcον and ἀγλααῖcι μερίμναιc with εὐκλέϊ λόγωι.[264] Note that here the 'zero option' has been chosen, instead of a repetition of the verb with a present tense stem form.

Cf. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπεὶ cυνεγένοντο ἀλλήλοιc, Cυέννεcιc μὲν ἔδωκε Κύρωι χρήματα πολλὰ εἰc τὴν cτρατιάν, Κῦροc δὲ ἐκείνωι (Ø) δῶρα ἃ νομίζεται παρὰ βαcιλεῖ τίμια, X.*An.*1.2.27. Whereas the 'zero option' is the normal procedure in English, repetition of the verb with a present tense stem form is by far more common in Greek. Cf. ὣc ἄρα φωνήcαc δῶκε ξίφοc ἀργυρόηλον | cὺν κολεῶι τε φέρων καὶ ἐυτμήτωι τελαμῶνι· | Αἴαc δὲ ζωcτῆρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν, *Il.*7.303-5, which we would paraphrase as 'Hector gave Ajax a sword, Ajax (Ø) Hector a belt.' See Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 27-33, with more examples. See also Sicking, *Semantics of the Verb*, p. 75 (where in lines 6/7 from the top "former" and "latter" are to be exchanged) with n. 122.

• *Semantics:* The noun **μέριμνα**, 'concern,' denotes personal commitment to a future situation. If this situation is unpleasant, it must be interpreted as 'care, anxiety.'

As in ἀνίκ' ἀνθρώπων καματώδεεc οἴχονται μέριμναι | cτηθέων ἔξω, *fr.*124.5/6; δυcφόρων cχοινίον μεριμνᾶν, *fr.*248.

If this future situation is pleasant and if one tries to achieve this situation, μέριμνα must be interpreted as 'ambition, endeavour.' In Pindar the noun is, not surprisingly, used most frequently with reference to 'ambition' for fame and glory, for the desirable situation that is a result of a victory won at the Great Games.

Cf. νέων δὲ μέριμναι cὺν πόνοιc εἰλιccόμεναι | δόξαν εὑρίcκοντι, *fr.*227.1/2; *O.*1.106-11, *O.*2.53/4, *P.*8.88-92 (with my note, pp. 588/9). Cf. also *fr.*94b.62. In ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δεῖμα μὲν παροιχομένων | καρτερὰν ἔπαυcε μέριμναν· τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸc | ἄρειον ἀεὶ βλέπειν | χρῆμα πάν, *I.*8.11-4, μέριμνα refers to the poet's ambition to contribute to the victor's fame and glory.

So Aristoclidas has added the Thearion to his 'concerns,' i.e., the Thearion has become one of the things he will take care of in the future.[265]

---

264 Thus also Bury *ad loc.* (p. 58), Farnell, *ad loc.* (p. 260). ἀγλααῖcι μερίμναιc is taken as an instrumental dative by the scholia (122c, d, III 59 Dr.), followed by Fennell (*ad loc.*, p. 35). However, its being a complement to προcέθηκε is strongly suggested by the parallel structure of the preceding phrase. Moreover, if this phrase would mean that Aristoclides has added the Thearion to the present song of praise, μερίμναιc would be an empty and unprecise addition, for if he did so, he did so by means of his victory rather than by means of his ambitions, and that he did so by means of his victory is clear enough from line 67.

265 One of the scholiasts on this line takes μερίμναιc as referring to Pindar's own ambitions, i.e., to his endeavours of contributing to the victor's fame and glory, as in *I.*8.12 (οἱ δέ, ταῖc ἐμαῖc μερίμναιc καὶ τοῖc ἐμοῖc ποιήμαcι cυνέζευξε τῶι εὐκλεεῖ λόγωι, Σ. 122d, III 59 Dr.). It seems, however, unnatrual not to take the subject of the sentence as the one whose μέριμναι are being referred to.

In Homer the adjective **ἀγλαός**, 'shining, bright,' is used exclusively as a qualification of people or physical objects, excepting ἀγλαὸν εὖχος, *Il.*7.203. Pindar also uses it as a qualification of people (*O.*14.7, *I.*6.62, *I.*8.27) and of objects, which can be imagined to indeed have a gleam (γέρας, *O.*8.11; κομᾶν πλόκαμοι, *P.*4.82; cκᾶπτος, *N.*11.4; πρόθυρον, *I.*8.2, αὐλά, *Pae.*7.3; and perhaps also τύμβος, *N.*4.20; δένδρα, *O.*2.73). It is, however, also used metaphorically as qualifying abstract notions, as in ἐν αἱμακουρίαις | ἀγλααῖςι, *O.*1.90/1; ἐξ ἀγλαῶν[266] | ἀέθλων, *P.*5.52/3; ἀγ-γλααὶ νῖκαι, *N.*11.20, etc. For further discussion of the word see H. Kriegler, *Untersuchungen zu den optischen und akustischen Daten der bacchylideischen Dichtung*, Diss. Wien 1969, 102-9; L.F. Guillen, *Píndaro. Estructura y resortes del quehacer poetico*, Madrid 1975. See also ἀγλαόκολπον, line 56 above. For **cεμνός** qualifying 'sacred' places, associted with a deity (or hero), cf. *O.*9.6, *P.*9.30, *N.*1.1, *N.*10.28, *fr.*95.2; see further my note on *N.*5.25 (pp. 143/4). On **Πυθίου Θεάριον** and the council of *thearoi* see next note.

70. Πυθίου Θεάριον

The scholia associate the Θεάριον with θεωροί. In fact, θεαρία (and derivatives) is the Doric form of θεωρία (and derivatives).

Cf. ἀποςτεῖλαι δὲ καὶ θεαρίας ἐς τὰς ἐν τᾶι Ἑλλάδι παναγύριας, Ἴςθμια καὶ Νέμεα καὶ Ὀλύμπια καὶ Πύθια in Demosthenes *Oratio de Corona* (91) which is in Doric dialect; cf. also μνάςει δὲ καί τινα ναίο[ν]θ' ἑκὰς ἡρωΐδος θεαρίας, *Pae.*14.35-7 ("*sc.* Pindarum qui ipse non adest in hac 'theoria'?", Snell-Maehler in app. crit.). Cf. also Paus.2.31.6, *IG* 4.748.16, cited below.

According to both scholiasts on this line, the Thearion was a public building in Aegina. The a-scholium takes it as the home of the *theoroi* of Apollo, being either the sacral officials of the temple of Apollo Pythius in Aegina itself or ἄρχοντες ('magistrates'?),[267] whereas the b-scholium remarks that it was the place where symposia were held and that is has been called after the *theoroi*, being the official Aeginetan delegates to Pythian Apollo at Delphi.[268] The remains of the Thearion have been identified in their re-use in a late ancient wall on Colonna Hill at the north side of the terrace of the Apollo temple. "The blocks show that the Thearion was a small Doric building of fine workmanship, to be dated to the last quarter of the

---

[266] Mosch.: ἀγαυῶν V: ἀγαθῶν BDEG.

[267] ἔςτιν ἐν Αἰγίνηι Πυθίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόν, ἐν ὧι οἱ θεωροὶ διῃτῶντο οἱ τὰ θεῖα φυλάςςοντες· θεωροὶ γὰρ οἷον θεοφύλακες. οἱ δέ, ὅτι ἐν τοῦ Πυθίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερῶι οἶκός ἐςτι καλούμενος Θεάριον διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, οἳ καλοῦνται θεωροί, ἐνταῦθα διαιτᾶςθαι, Σ. 122a (III 59 Dr.).

[268] Πυθίου Θεάριον· τόπος ἐν Αἰγίνηι δημόςιος, ἔνθα τὰ ςυμπόςια· εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν θεωρῶν τῶν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα πεμπομένων, Σ. 122b (III 59 Dr.).

sixth century."[269] Several inscriptions survive, from the Hellenistic period down to the third century A.D., the later of which record organizers of public feasts.[270] So the assertion of the scholia that the Thearion was a building is confirmed by archeological evidence, as well as its association with the cult of Apollo on Aegina.[271] It can therefore be taken for granted that the main function of the *thearoi* was a religious one, connected with the cult of Apollo on Aegina. Whether they played any role in secular hierarchy there is no means of telling. From the fact that Aristoclidas' membership of this council is mentioned in this ode, it may be deduced that the function was considered an honorary one, not unfitting to a scion of a noble family. Cf. *N.*11.

Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 314-21, attempts to reconstruct the activities of the council of *thearoi* in more detail. The institution of a permanent body of delegates to Delphinian Apollo can be paralleled to the Πύθιοι in Sparta and Mantinea.[272] However, lists of Aeginetan *thearoi* from Delphi do not survive, which makes the association with the cult of Apollo there problematic. To the second opinion of the a-scholion, that the *thearoi* were ἄρχοντες, the council of *theoroi* on Thasos and in Naupactus may be adduced as a parallel.[273] Figueira, pp. 319-21, suggests that the institution may have originated from before the Aeginetan independence, the *thearoi* being connected with the cult of Apollo Pythieus on the Argolid and in that capacity also political representatives of Argos in Aegina. But evidence is very scanty indeed. See further also P. Boesch, Θεωρός. *Untersuchungen zur Epangelie griechischer Feste*, Diss. 1908. On the Thasian *theoroi* in connection with the athlete Theogenes see also H.W. Pleket 'The Participants in the Olympic Games: Social Background and Mentality', *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games (5-9 September 1988)*, edd. W. Coulson & H. Kyrieleis, Athens 1992, 147-152, here p. 150, who argues that "the *theoroi* were not the holders of 'minor posts'; they presumably constituted the second group of magistrates after the *archontes* and their function may have been comparable to that of the *nomophylax*. Pouilloux and others write about a magistry which was much sought after by the great families; actually members of one and the same

[269] Figueira, *Aegina*, p. 315. See W. Wurster & F. Felten, *Die spätrömische Akropolis, Alt-Ägina* (ed. H. Walter) 1.2, Mainz 1975, 32-5, 50-3.

[270] See Wurster & Felten, *op. cit.*, 42-52; Welter, p. 87.

[271] Pausanias mentions a sanctuary of Thearian Apollo at Troezen (τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Θεαρίου κατασκευάσαι μὲν Πιτθέα ἔφασαν, ἔστι δὲ ὧν οἶδα παλαιότατον, 2.31.6). Cf. *IG* 4.748.16 from Troezen (iv B.C.). See also Farnell, *Cults*, IV p. 217.

[272] Hdt.6.57.2, X.*Resp.Lac.*15.5; Mantinea: Th.5.47.9.

[273] Figueira, *Aegina*, p. 317. For Thasos see J. Pouilloux, *Études Thasiennes: Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, Paris 1954-8, III pp. 238-41. For Naupactus: G. Busolt & H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, 2 vols., Munich 1920, 1926, p. 1531.

family are on record on the list of *theoroi*." Cf. also J.K. Davies, *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, New York 1981; Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 163-94.

70-76

Trial brings to light the full realisation (of those things) by means of which one may be superior, among young boys a boy, among men a man, thirdly among elders,—each portion as we, mortal race, have it. Mortal life also drives four qualities admired in a man and tells us to give thought to what lies in front. These he lacks not.

70-71. ἐν δὲ πείραι τέλος | διαφαίνεται ὧν τις ἐξοχώτερος γένηται
'Test brings to light the full realization of those things (qualities) which make a man more outstanding.'

• *The concept of πείρα:* A man achieves κλέος by displaying certain qualities that are highly valued by his fellow citizens, i.e., ἀρεταί. A man possesses ἀρεταί from his birth. They cannot be 'learned' (see lines 40-2 above with my notes). Possessing ἀρεταί, however, is not sufficient in itself for achieving κλέος. They have to 'come to light.' One must bring one's qualities to light by submitting oneself to a test. Competing in the Games is one way to do this, the way Aristoclidas has chosen, fighting a war is another, as Peleus (34), Telamon (36-9), and Achilles (59-63) have done. Men who can be expected to possess ἀρεταί—on the basis of their having sprouted from a family that proved to possess them on earlier occasions—go and compete at the Games in order to submit themselves to the test and to prove by being victorious that they do indeed possess the qualities they have been expected to possess. This idea is expressed in Θεανδρίδαιςι δ' ἀεξιγυίων ἀέθλων | κάρυξ ἑτοῖμος ἔβαν | Οὐλυμπίαι τε καὶ Ἰςθμοῖ Νεμέαι τε ςυνθέμενος, | ἔνθα πεῖραν ἔχοντες οἴκαδε κλυτοκάρπων | οὐ νέοντ' ἄνευ ςτεφάνων, *N.*4.73-7, and negatively in οὐδὲ παναγυρίων ξυνᾶν ἀπεῖχον | καμπύλαν δίφρον, Πανελλάνεςςι δ' εριζόμενοι δαπάναι χαῖρον ἵππων. | τῶν ἀπειράτων γὰρ ἄγνωτοι ςιωπαί, *I.*4.28-30. (It is illuminating to compare also: πειρῶντι δὲ καὶ χρυςὸς ἐν βαςάνωι πρέπει | καὶ νόος ὀρθός, *P.*10.67/8 [cf. *fr.*122.16], the only literal example; gold has the same quality both before and after testing it, but the point is that its quality becomes 'visible' only by means of the touch-stone, and the same holds true for the νόος ὀρθός,—as well as for ἀρεταί.) This 'testing' results in objective proof, ἔλεγχος, about one's qualities (used negatively, in the sense of 'refutation' of one's qualities in: τὰ μὲν {ἐν} ἅρμαςι καλλίνικοι πάλαι | Ὀλυμπίαι τ' ἀγώνων πολυφάτων | ἔςχον θοὰν ἀκτῖνα ςὺν ἵπποις, | Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ ςτάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεγξαν | Ἑλλανίδα ςτρατιὰν

ὠκύτατι, *P.*11.46-50; see further my note on ἐλεγχέεσσιν, line 15 above, pp. 624-6). In οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω | λόγον· διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος· | ἅπερ Κλυμένοιο παῖδα | Λαμνιάδων γυναικῶν ἔλυσεν ἐξ ἀτιμίας, *O.*4.17-20, the πεῖρα motif is introduced as applying to the poet in order to be, in retrospect, applied also to the mythical victor Erginus.[274] The concept applies solely to the poet in: νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βασάνωι | ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος, *N.*8.20/1. See also my notes on *P.*8.36 (p. 521) and *N.*5.53 ἀρετάν (pp. 188-90).

For the πεῖρα concept in authors other than Pindar, cf. e.g. πῆρά τοι μαθήσιος ἀρχά, Alcm.*fr.*125 *PMG* (= *fr.* 293 Calame, who attributes it to Alcmaeon); δόξα μὲν ἀνθρώποισι κακὸν μέγα, πεῖρα δ' ἄριστον, Thgn.571; ἔστω δ' ὦν μηδὲν ἀπείρητον· αὐτόματον γὰρ οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πείρης πάντα ἀνθρώποισι φιλέει γίνεσθαι, Hdt.7.9γ (with P. Stork *ad loc.*); πείραι θην πάντα τελεῖται, Theocr.15.62. See further Bowra, *Pindar*, 178 ff.

• *Semantics:* The verb **διαφαίνομαι** means 'to be visible through' a transparent substance.

Cf., e.g., ἔπειτα δέ οἱ περιστᾶσι στήλην ἐξ ὑάλου πεποιημένην κοίλην ...· ἐν μέσηι δὲ τῆι στήληι ἐνεὼν διαφαίνεται ὁ νέκυς, οὔτε ὀδμὴν οὐδεμίαν ἄχαριν παρεχόμενος οὔτε ἄλλο ἀεικὲς οὐδέν· καὶ ἔχει πάντα φανερὰ ὁμοίως αὐτῶι τῶι νέκυϊ, Hdt.3.24, referring to the Ethiopian habit of burying corpses in crystal coffins. A λίθος διαφαινόμενον is a 'transparent stone' (Agatharg.82). Since glowing objects show light through and seem therefore to be translucent, the verb may be used to refer to 'glowing,' as in ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τάχ' ὁ μοχλὸς ἐλάινος ἐν πυρὶ μέλλεν | ἅψεσθαι χλωρός περ ἐών, διεφαίνετο δ' αἰνῶς, | καὶ τότ' ἐγὼν ἆσσον φέρον ἐκ πυρός, *Od.*9.378-80. In Τρώων αὖτ' ἀγορὴν ποιήσατο φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ, | νόσφι νεῶν ἀγαγών, ποταμῶι ἔπι δινήεντι, | ἐν καθαρῶι, ὅθι δὴ νεκύων διεφαίνετο χῶρος, *Il.*8.489-91 (cf. 10.199), the reference is to grounds that 'are visible through the corpses,' i.e., that 'show clear of dead bodies.' Cf. also καὶ ἀνὴρ Μυσὸς καὶ τοὔνομα τοῦτο ἔχων τῶν Κρητῶν λαβὼν δέκα ἔμενεν ἐν λασίωι χωρίωι καὶ προσεποιεῖτο τοὺς πολεμίους πειρᾶσθαι λανθάνειν· αἱ δὲ πέλται αὐτῶν ἄλλοτε καὶ ἄλλοτε διεφαίνοντο χαλκαῖ οὖσαι. οἱ μὲν οὖν πολέμιοι ταῦτα διορῶντες ἐφοβοῦντο ὡς ἐνέδραν οὖσαν, X.*An.*5.2.30, of brazen shields flashing through the thicket.

Here the verb is used metaphorically. The τέλος of those things by means of which one may be more superior 'shines through' in a trial, i.e., it is being 'brought to light.' The associations evoked by the verb may be that the τέλος in trial finally 'reveals itsels' after having been 'hidden' for a long time.

The metaphorical use may be compared to: ἕν τε οὐδὲ ἓν κατέστη ἴαμα ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅτι χρῆν προσφέροντας ὠφελεῖν· τὸ γάρ τωι ξυνενεγκὸν ἄλλον τοῦτο

---

[274] See Lozza, *Acme* 29, 1976, 165/6, and Mader *ad loc.* (p. 51). On the procedures of double applicability of imagery, which is comparable to the double applicability of a gnomic statement, see my 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89, 1994, 315-327.

ἔβλαπτεν. cῶμά τε αὔταρκες ὂν οὐδὲν διεφάνη πρὸς αὐτὸ ἰςχύος πέρι ἢ ἀςθενείας, ἀλλὰ πάντα ξυνῄρει καὶ τὰ πάςῃ διαίτῃ θεραπευόμενα, Th.2.51; κοινῇ τε ἀπωςάμενοι τὸν βάρβαρον, ὕςτερον οὐ πολλῷ διεκρίθηςαν πρός τε Ἀθηναίους καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους οἵ τε ἀποςτάντες βαςιλέως Ἕλληνες καὶ οἱ ξυμπολεμήςαντες. δυνάμει γὰρ ταῦτα μέγιςτα διεφάνη· ἴςχυον γὰρ οἱ μὲν κατὰ γῆν, οἱ δὲ ναυςίν, Th.1.18; ἐψευςμένοις μὲν τῆς Ἀθηναίων δυνάμεως ἐπὶ τοςοῦτον ὅςη ὕςτερον διεφάνη, Th.4.108, as it 'revealed itself' in the long run; καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ὁπλῖται οὔτ' ἐκείνοις ὅςοιπερ κομποῦνται, οὔτε οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες διεφάνηςαν τοςοῦτοι ὄντες ὅςους ἕκαςτοι ςφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἠρίθμουν, Th.6.17; ἀλλ' ὥςπερ γὰρ ἐν ςώματι, ὅςοι νέοι ὄντες μέγεθος ἔλαβον, ὅμως ἐμφαίνεται τὸ νεαρὸν αὐτοῖς ὃ κατηγορεῖ τὴν ὀλιγοετίαν, οὕτω καὶ Κύρου ἐκ τῆς πολυλογίας οὐ θράςος διεφαίνετο, ἀλλ' ἁπλότης καὶ φιλοςτοργία, ὥςτ' ἐπεθύμει ἄν τις ἔτι πλείω αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν ἢ ςιωπῶντι παρεῖναι, X.*Cyr.*1.4.3.

The verb διαφαίνω occurs once more in Pindar, in the active and in quite an original sense that is hardly comparable to *h.l.*: καιομένα δ' αὐτῷι (*sc.* Ἀπόλλωνι) διέφαινε πυρά, *P.*3.44, of fire parting like the red sea for Apollo. The fire 'shines apart,' i.e., 'divides its light,' as to allow a passage.

The adjective **ἔξοχος** means 'standing out' among something else, i.e., 'prominent' above something else, 'jutting.'

Cf. βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔξοχοι κατάκεινται | Δωδώναθεν ἀρχόμεναι πρὸς Ἰόνιον πόρον, *N.*4.52/3, of mountains; τίς τ' ἄρ' ὅδ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε, | ἔξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλήν τε καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους; *Il.*3.226/7.

When used, like *h.l.*, in a metaphorical sense to qualify persons—with respect to their qualities, rather than to their literal height (contrast *Il.*3.227) —, it means 'standing out' among others, i.e., 'outstanding, superior, eminent.'

Cf. περὶ θνατῶν δ' ἔςεςθαι μάντιν ἐπιχθονίοις | ἔξοχον, *O.*6.50/1; cf. also Homeric expressions like ἔξοχος ἄλλων, *Il.*6.194, etc.; ἔξοχος ἡρώων, *Il.*18.56, etc. Cf. also ἔξοχα used as an adverb (*O.*1.2, *O.*8.23, *P.*5.26) and ἐξόχως (*O.*9.69). Often the contrasting notion, against which something is 'standing out,' is not explicitly expressed: καὶ μέλλεις ὑπὲρ πόντου | Διὸς ἔξοχον ποτὶ κᾶπον ἐνεῖκαι, *P.*9.52/3; Διὸς ὑψίςτου προφάταν ἔξοχον | ὀρθόμαντιν Τειρεςίαν, *N.*1.60/1, perhaps deliberaly combining the adjective with the semantically cognate words ὕψιςτος and ὀρθός; τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ἀντιτύχῃ, | ἔλπεταί τις ἕκαςτος ἐξοχώτατα φάςθαι, *N.*4.91/2; πλατεῖαι πάντοθεν λογίοιςιν ἐντὶ πρόςοδοι | νᾶςον εὐκλέα τάνδε κοςμεῖν· ἐπεί ςφιν Αἰακίδαι | ἔπορον ἔξοχον αἶςαν ἀρετὰς ἀποδεικνύμενοι μεγάλας, *N.*6.45-7; Cκύριαι δ' ἐς ἀμελξιν γλάγεος αἶγες ἐξοχώταται, *fr.*106.4. In ὅςςα δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις, | Τιμοδημίδαι ἐξοχώτατοι προλέγονται, *N.*2.17/8, both ἐξοχώτατοι and προλέγονται suggest a contrast with the defeated competitors.

For **τέλος** in this sense cf. βαςανιςθέντι δὲ χρυςῶι τέλος[, *Pae.*14.37/8. For the expression ἐν X τέλος, cf. νῦν δ' ἔλπομαι μέν, ἐν θεῷι γε μὰν | τέλος, *O.*13.104/5; Ζεῦ πάτερ, ... πὰν δὲ τέλος | ἐν τὶν ἔργων, *N.*10.29/30. For τέλος see also line 25 above. See also F.M.J. Waanders, *The History of ΤΕΛΟC and ΤΕΛΕΩ in Ancient Greek*, Diss. Amsterdam 1983; Thummer, *Religiosität*, p. 104.

•*Attraction of the relative:* The relative **ὧν** in line 71, having the function of a dative in the subordinate clause, assimilates the case of its omitted antecedent, which is an attributive adjunct to τέλος (ἐν δὲ πείραι τέλος διαφαίνεται τούτων, οἷς τις ἐξοχώτερος γένηται).

For the dative in similar contexts cf. ἄκραις ἀρεταῖς ὑπερελθόντων ἱεροῖς ἐν ἀέθλοις, *O.*13.15; πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς | ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος | ὤρουσαν ἀρέσθαι, *O.*9.100-2. For the relative being assimilated to the case of the omitted antecedent, cf. τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ἀντιτύχηι, | ἔλπεταί τις ἕκαστος ἐξοχώτατα φάσθαι, *N.*4.91/2 (ταῦτα ὧν); ἐκ τῶν παρόντων καὶ ὧν ὁρᾶτε, Th.5.87 (καὶ ἐκ τούτων, ἃ ὁρᾶτε), etc. See further Kühner-Gerth, II ii, pp. 406-13 (§ 555). See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 323 (§ 401).

•*Subjunctive:* The subjunctive is used in a general conditional relative clause. The sentence as a whole expresses a general supposition, the main clause referring to a general truth while "the relative clause refers in a general way to *any* act or acts of a given class" (Goodwin, *Moods & Tenses*, p. 204 [§ 532]). In these cases the subjunctive in the relative clause is usually accompanied by ἄν/κε. See the examples cited by Goodwin, *loc. cit.* The subjunctive without ἄν or κε is, however, not uncommon in Homer (Goodwin, pp. 207/8 [§538]) and other early poetry (Goodwin, p. 208 [§ 540]).

For Pindar, cf. e.g. τᾶς (*sc.* Πίσας) ἄπο | θεόμοροι νίσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί, | ὧι τινι ... | ἀτρεκὴς Ἑλλανοδίκας γλεφάρων Αἰτωλὸς ἀνὴρ ὑψόθεν | ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάληι γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας, *O.*3.9-13; μῶμος ἐξ ἄλλων κρέμαται φθονεόντων | τοῖς, οἷς ποτε πρώτοις περὶ δωδέκατον δρόμον | ἐλαυνόντεσσιν αἰδοία ποτιστάξηι Χάρις εὐκλέα μορφάν, *O.*6.74-6; μέγα τοι κλέος αἰεί, | ὧιτινι σὸν (*sc.* Olympia) γέρας ἕσπητ' ἀγλαόν, *O.*8.10/1; ἐκ πόνων δ', οἳ σὺν νεότατι γένωνται σύν τε δίκαι, τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἡμέρα, *N.*9.44. Cf. also *O.*7.10/1, *O.*8.23-5, *P.*10.23. See also Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 267 (§ 333). Similar relative clauses may take ἄν or κε in Pindar also. Cf. e.g. τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὖ πρῶτον ἀέθλων· εὖ δ' ἀκούειν δευτέρα μοῖρ'· ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀνὴρ | ὃς ἂν ἐγκύρσηι καὶ ἕληι, στέφανον ὕψιστον δέδεκται, *P.*1.99/100; (Ἀπόλλων) δίδωσί τε Μοῖσαν οἷς ἂν ἐθέληι, *P.*5.65. In *P.*4.52 the subjunctive in the relative clause with κε expresses a future condition rather than a general supposition.[275]

•*Coordination:* In line 70 a gnomic passage begins, which is prompted by and comments upon the victor's latest career move. The only signal for the transition is **δέ**, which is implicit as to the status and relevance of the sentence in the light of its preceding context. See introduction pp. 26-30.

---

[275] "Pindar's unique prospective use of the subjunctive with a modal particle in a relative clause (where Attic prose would use a future indicative) is an archaism and probably adopted from Homer", Braswell *ad loc.* (p. 132). See Goodwin, § 568; Stahl, *Syntax*, pp. 286/7; Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, § 454; Schwyzer, II, pp. 311/3.

ANTISTROPHE Δ

72-74

Specifying the τις from the preceding line, these lines qualify the way in which πεῖρα should take place. Trial is the way to bring one's qualities to light. Each period of life demands its own specific qualities appropriate to its charactaristic activities. If one strives to bring one's qualities to light by submitting oneself to πεῖρα, one should do so by competing with one's age group, 'a boy with young boys, a man with men, and, thirdly, an older man with elders— (in other words, πεῖρα must take place according with) each portion (i.e. each time of life) as we, mortal race, have it.'

The idea of each age having its own characteristics and possibilities is implied also in θεόθεν ἐραίμαν καλῶν, | δυνατὰ μαιόμενος ἐν ἁλικίαι, *P*.11.50/1; a man's age determines what he should be striving at. "There is an appropriate scale of potentialities for each period of life."[276] One may also compare the famous line χρῆν μὲν κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρώτων δρέπεσθαι, θυμέ, σὺν ἁλικίαι, *fr*.123.1, and especially εἴη καὶ ἐρᾶν καὶ ἔρωτι | χαρίζεσθαι κατὰ καιρόν· | μὴ πρεσβυτέραν ἀριθμοῦ | δίωκε, θυμέ, πρᾶξιν, *fr*.127, implying that youth is the appropriate time to pick the fruits of love, while not yielding to it is the sad practice of old age. On the association of certain virtues with certain ages see further the appendix (pp. 643-5).

The idea of trial having to take place within the context of one's age group is consistent with athletic practice. At the Games each competitor competed in his own age category.[277] It will be clear, however, that these lines do not specifically refer to the age categories of the Great Games. The category of adolescents is not being referred to and παλαίτεροι, for obvious reasons, did not compete in the Games.[278] The category of elders derives its relevance from the preceding reference to the Thearion. See further interpretation, pp. 218-20.

---

[276] Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 71. He suggests that ἐν ἁλικίαι may also mean 'among my contempories' and Young (*Three Odes*, p. 19 n. 1) takes it as 'among my comrades'. To my mind, the literal interpretation of ἁλικία is by far more likely than a metaphorical one, since δυνατά implies some sort of limitations set upon the poet (and mankind in general?), which is hard to explain with the metaphorical interpretation.

[277] An allusion here to the age divisions in the Games was first seen be W.H.D. Rouse, *PCPS* 29, 1891, 16/7.

[278] The Nemean and Isthmian Games had three categories: boys (παῖδες), adolescents (ἀγένειοι), and men (ἄνδρες), unlike the Olympian and Pythian Games, which had only two categories: boys and men. See *N*.5.6 and 45 with my notes; Severyns, *Bacchylide*, 153-8. In συλαθεὶς ἀγενείων | μένεν ἀγῶνα πρεσβυτέρων, *O*.9.89/90, the πρεσβύτεροι are, of course, 'elder' in comparison to the ἀγένειοι; so the reference is to ἄνδρες. Evidence for veterans competition is lacking.

• *The 'puer-senex' motif*: There are a number of passages which share the characteristic with *h.l.* and the passages cited above of containing statements about the characteristic qualities of different age groups. However, as Braswell (on *P.*4.281/2, pp. 381/2) rightly observes, these passages express or imply a different thought. Whereas *h.l.* and *P.*11.50/1 express the idea of each age group having its own characteristics, the passages cited below are claiming for the victors praised in them "not just the qualities of [their] actual age, but rather the best qualities which are to be found in different age groups and indeed ones which are usually regarded as mutually exclusive."[279] Thus victors are said to be young with respect to their physical abilities and at the same time old regarding their mental capacities.

Cf. κεῖνος (*sc.* Damophilus) γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος, | ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρεσβὺς ἐγκύρσαις ἑκατονταετεῖ βιοτᾶι, *P.*4.281/2; γέροντα τὸν νοῦν, σάρκα δ' ἡβῶσαν φύει, A.*Th.*622. Cf. also κρέσσονα μὲν ἁλικίας | νόον φέρβεται (*sc.* Arcesilaus) | γλῶσσαν τε, *P.*5.109-11. It is instructive to compare also: νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράσος | δεινῶν πολέμων· ὅθεν φαμὶ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, | τὰ μὲν ἐν ἱπποσόαισιν ἄνδρεσσι μαρνάμενον, τὰ δ' ἐν πεζομάχαισι· βουλαὶ δὲ πρεσβύτεραι | ἀκίνδυνον ἐμοὶ ἔπος ⟨σὲ⟩ ποτὶ πάντα λόγον | ἐπαινεῖν παρέχοντι, *P.*2.63-7. One of the characteristic—or preferable—activities of youths is to fight wars; this is what Hieron has successfully done. So Pindar has enough reason to praise him. One of the desirable qualities of elders is the ability of displaying wisdom in βουλαί; this is one of Hieron's qualities as well; his βουλαί are even 'older' than his actual age. So he deserves his praise even more, which makes it ἀκίνδυνον for the poet to praise him to an even greater extent. The *puer-senex* motif may also underlie: χεῖρες δὲ καὶ ἦτορ ἴσον. | φύονται δὲ καὶ νέοις | ἐν ἀνδράσιν πολιαί | θαμάκι παρὰ τὸν ἁλικίας ἐοικότα χρόνον, *O.*4.25-7.

This so-called *puer-senex* motif enjoyed great popularity in panegyric works of all ages. Dionysus of Halicarnassus explicitly recommends to praise a young ruler by saying that he is νέος μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν, πρεσβύτερος δὲ τὴν φρόνησιν (*Rh.*5.3). See further: Braswell, *loc. cit.*; E.R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern 1969[7], 108-12; H.D. Kemper, *Rat und Tat*, Diss. Bonn 1960, 35-8, 77-81; Apostol.7.29 (II, 402.7-11 L.-S. with note *ad loc.*); W. Simon on Claudianus, *Panegyr. Theod.* (17).18.

72-3. ἐν παισὶ νέοισι παῖς, ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀνήρ, τρίτον | ἐν παλαιτέροισι ἐξοχώτερος γένηται is to be supplied from the preceding line. The nominatives elaborate upon τις. The prepositional phrases refer to the group of peers compared to whom one may be 'more outstanding.' For the thought implied see the preceding note. The asyndetic

[279] Braswell, *loc. cit.*

trifolder is anticlimactic in sofar as each member is provided with less qualifications than the preceding one: in the first an adjective occurs, the second has no adjective, in the third also the nominative is absent.

For **ἐν**, 'among,' i.e., 'in comparison to,' cf. line 80 below. The type of expression (ἐν with repetition of the noun) may be compared to cμικρὸc ἐν cμικροῖc, μέγαc ἐν μεγάλοιc | ἔccομαι, τὸν δ' ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ φραcὶν | δαίμον' ἀcκήcω κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μαχανάν, *P.*3.107-9, which, however, expresses a very different thought; the poet states that he intends to adapt himself to the circumstances fate provides him with (cμικροῖc and μεγάλοιc are neutres). Cf. also *P.*4.281/2 quoted in the preceding note. For **τρίτον** used as an adverb, cf. B.4.4.

• *Text; prosody:* The mss. have ἐν δ' ἀνδράcιν ἀνήρ, where the metre requires ⏑–⏑⏑––. The easiest correction is to delete δ' (Gottfried Hermann). The lengthening of the initial α of ἀνήρ is a liberty of epic prosody (cf. *Il.*2.553, 701, 10.293, Hes.*Op.*297, etc.), adopted by Pindar (*O.*14.7, *N.*2.3, *N.*9.15, *I.*4.70). The nominative singular of the noun is scanned ⏑– in *O.*1.64, *O.*3.12, *O.*6.7, *O.*8.73, *O.*10.21, 93, *O.*11.10, *O.*13.31, *P.*1.69, 91, 99, *P.*2.13, 29, 37, 86, *P.*4.78, 132, 236, *P.*5.3, *P.*6.38, *P.*9.87, *P.*10.22, *N.*3.43, *N.*4.39, *N.*7.42, 64, 87, *N.*8.49, *I.*2.11, *I.*4.53, *I.*6.51, *fr.*61.2.

Mss. V and D have τρίτατον; B has τρίτατοc. The metre requires ⏑–. The easiest correction is to adopt the Byzantine emendation τρίτον. Forms of τρίτατοc are not attested in the extant works of Pindar. Forms of τρίτοc occur seven times, apart from *h.l.* Bacchylides has both τρίτατοc and τρίτοc once (1.112, 4.4 resp.).

73-74. μέροc ἕκαcτον οἷον ἔχομεν | βρότεον ἔθνοc

'Each portion as we, mortal race, have it,' i.e., 'every single period of life that we humans know.' This phrase, syntactically in apposition to the nominatives, summarises the preceding one and a half lines.

For **μέροc** referring to a 'portion' (i.e. a period) of life, cf. ἀλλ' ἤδη με γηραιὸν μέροc ἁλικίαc | ἀμφιπολεῖ, *P.*4.157/8. For ἔθνοc see my note on *N.*5.43 (p. 611). For **βρότεοc** cf. *O.*9.34, *P.*1.41, *P.*12.1, *I.*8.36, *fr.*61.4, *fr.*222.3. The expression **βρότεον ἔθνοc** may be compared to ὅcαιc δὲ βροτὸν[280] ἔθνοc ἀγλαΐαιc ἁπτόμεcθα, περαίνει πρὸc ἔcχατον | πλόον, *P.*10.28/9.

74-75. ἐλᾶι δὲ καὶ τέccαραc ἀρετὰc | ὁ θνατὸc αἰών

It is argued in the appendix (pp. 638-47) that: (1) ... | ὁ θνατὸc αἰών should be read; (2a) τέccαραc ἀρετάc does not refer to 'The Four Cardinal Virtues,' (2b) nor to any other autonomous, traditional *tetrad* of virtues, which could be identified by Pindar's audience with-

---

[280] E. Schmid: βρότεον codd.

out any guidance by the context; (3) τέccαρας ἀρετάς refers to three virtues characteristic for each of the three stages of life (unspecified here), the fourth being φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον as it is identified by the second half of line 75; (4) the verb ἐλᾶι, 'spur on, set in motion,' implies that 'mortal life' is in some way or another the starting-point, origin or instigation of the four ἀρεταί; the association of three of the four ἀρεταί with the three consecutive periods of life makes it understandable that the course of human life is presented as 'producing' them; moreover, ἐλᾶι is a metaphor, borrowed from the terminology of driving chariots, suggesting that the four ἀρεταί are a four-in-hand. For the relevance of all this to the victor see interpretation, pp. 218-20.

• *Coordination:* **δέ** (74) introduces the next step in the argument. **καί** underscores the parallelism between the three periods of life and the three ἀρεταί, expanding them with a forth. One could paraphraze: 'Moreover (δέ), (as it consists in three periods) life drives also (καί) four ἀρεταί, (the fourth being ...)'.[281] For **δ'** (75) see next note.

75. φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκείμενον

'It (mortal life) says: Give heed to what lies in front of you.' In the context the maxim is presented as the forth ἀρετά, not associated with any specific period of life. 'Sticking to what is near' can be regarded as an ἀρετά, a quality admired in a man, since it implies consciousness of one's limitations and of the capricious nature of fate. See further interpretation, pp. 218-20. The poet himself, too, acts upon the maxim φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον, since he immediately procedes to fulfill his encomiastic task in its narrowest sense and to praise the victor by applying his general remarks on the four ἀρεταί to him.

• *The Theme of the Near and the Far:* The thought 'stick to what is near (present, possible) and do not seek for what is far away (absent, future, impossible)' occurs very frequently in Pindar. Mortal life is short[282] and unstable,[283] divine powers are able to turn the table any moment,[284] and a man cannot possibly be certain about what the fu-

[281] With the first of the two interpretations regarding the reference of the four ἀρεταί (context independently referring to an autonomous list of four traditional virtues, see appendix) καί is not easy to explain. Then, καί must be understood as introducing another characteristic of mortal life following upon the observations concerning its division in three periods. One would have to paraphrase loosely: 'And (δέ), speaking about mortal life, it may be remarked in addition (καί) that ...'.

[282] *I.*7.39-44; cf. also *N.*11.13-6, etc.

[283] *N.*11.39-48, *I.*7.39-44, *I.*8.12-5, *P.*8.92-6, *O.*12.5-12, etc.

[284] *I.*7.39-44, *P.*12.29/30, etc.

[285] *N.*11.39-48, *P.*10.60-3, *O.*12.5-12, etc.

ture will bring him.[285] Therefore one should not have idle hopes and expectations.[286] One must adapt oneself to one's limitations and to the circumstances provided by fate.[287] Likewise, a man must be content with his achievements; he must know his limits and he must not try to accomplish more and more, going beyond his possibilities.[288] Warnings like 'do not try to be a god' sometimes occur in these contexts.[289] The concept of 'measure' may also occur in these contexts, referring to consciousness of the boundaries between what is possible and what goes too far.[290] It is a very human mistake to disregard all this, but it is also a very stupid and dangerous mistake to make.[291]

Specifically viewed from the perspective of the victor, the maxim may be taken as deriving its relevance from the idea that the victor in his moment of glory is especially liable to overestimate his possibilities, to forget his human limitations and to think more of himself than he actually is. Thus the maxim may function as a warning to the victor not to let success go to his head.[292]

Cf. ἐν cχέρωι δ' οὔτ' ὦν μέλαιναι καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι, | δένδρεά τ' οὐκ ἐθέλει πάcαιc ἐτέων περόδοιc | ἄνθοc εὐῶδεc φέρειν πλούτωι ἴcον, | ἀλλ' ἐναμείβοντι. καὶ θνατὸν οὕτωc ἔθνοc ἄγει | μοῖρα[293]. τὸ δ' ἐκ Διὸc ἀνθρώποιc caφὲc οὐχ ἕπεται | τέκμαρ· ἀλλ' ἔμπαν μεγαλανορίαιc ἐμβαίνομεν, | ἔργα τε πολλὰ μενοινῶντεc· δέδεται γὰρ ἀναιδεῖ | ἐλπίδι γυῖα, προμαθείαc δ' ἀπόκειν-ται ῥοαί. | κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν· | ἀπροcίκτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀξύτεραι μανίαι, *N.*11.39-48; ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ θραccέτω φθόνοc, | ὅτι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων | ἕκαλοc ἔπειμι γῆραc ἔc τε τὸν μόρcιμον | αἰῶνα. θνάιcκομεν γὰρ ὁμῶc ἅπαντεc· | δαίμων τ' ἄϊcοc· τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τιc | παπταίνει, βραχὺc ἐξικέcθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν, *I.*7.39-44; τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸc | ἄρειον ἀεὶ βλέπειν | χρῆμα πάν· δολιὸc γὰρ αἰὼν ἐπ' ἀνδράcι κρέμαται, | ἑλίccων βίου πόρον· ἰατὰ δ' ἐcτὶ βροτοῖc cύν γ' ἐλευθερίαι | καὶ τά. χρὴ δ' ἀγαθὰν ἐλπίδ' ἀνδρὶ μέλειν, *I.*8.12-5; καὶ γὰρ | ἑτέροιc ἑτέρων ἔρωτεc ἔκνιξαν φρέναc· | τῶν δ' ἕκαcτοc ὀρούει, | τυχών κεν ἁρπαλέαν cχέθοι φροντίδα τὰν πὰρ ποδόc· | τὰ δ' εἰc ἐνιαυτὸν ἀτέκμαρτον προνοῆcαι, *P.*10.60-3; τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν ἄcτυ κα[ὶ –⏑–] | καὶ cυγγένει' ἀνδρὶ φ[⏑–⏑–] | cτέρξαι· ματ[αί]ων δὲ [⏑⏑––] | ἑκὰc ἐόντων, *Pae.*4.32-4. Cf. also the following three passages from *P.*3: in ἤρατο τῶν ἀπεόντων (*sc.* Coronis)· οἷα καὶ πολλοὶ πάθον. | ἔcτι δὲ φῦλον ἐν ἀνθρώποιcι ματαιότατον, | ὅcτιc αἰcχύνων ἐπιχώρια παπταίνει τὰ πόρcω, | μεταμώνια θηρεύων ἀκράντοιc ἐλπίcιν, *P.*3.20-3, Coronis is said to have made the mistake many humans make, and she is punished for it; χρὴ τὰ ἐοικότα

---

[286] *N.*11.39-48, *P.*3.20-3, *O.*12.5-12, etc.
[287] *P.*3.59-62, 107-9, etc.
[288] *I.*4.11-3, *O.*1.113/4, *O.*5.23/4, *I.*5.12-6, *P.*3.59-62, *P.*10.22-30, etc.
[289] *O.*5.23/4, *I.*5.12-6, *P.*3.59-62, *P.*10.22-30.
[290] *I.*6.71, *N.*11.39-48, *P.*4.286, etc.
[291] *P.*3.20-3.
[292] *O.*1.113/4, *O.*5.27, *I.*5.14-6, *I.*6.12/3, etc.
[293] Cf. *N.*6.9-11.

πὰρ δαιμόνων μαστευέμεν θναταῖς φρασὶν | γνόντα τὸ πὰρ ποδός, οἵας εἰμὲν αἴσας. | μή, φίλα θυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον | σπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, lines 59-62, to which one may compare σμικρὸς ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις | ἔσσομαι, τὸν δ' ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ φρασὶν | δαίμον' ἀσκήσω κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μαχανάν, lines 107-9 of the same ode; both passages explicitly connect the idea with the maxim that one should adapt oneself to one's capacities and to the circumstances. That a man's limitations are also determined by his age appears from θεόθεν ἐραίμαν καλῶν, | δυνατὰ μαιόμενος ἐν ἁλικίαι, *P.*11.50/1.

For direct imperatives to the victor to limit his desire to the prosperity at hand, cf. esp. τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται | βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον, *O.*1.113/4. This imperative is given in terms of 'do not want to be a god' in: ὑγίεντα δ' εἴ τις ὄλβον ἄρδει, | ἐξαρκέων κτεάτεσσι καὶ εὐλογίαν προστιθείς, μὴ ματεύσηι θεὸς γενέσθαι, *O.*5.23/4, and especially: δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβωι, | εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούηι. | μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι· πάντ' ἔχεις, | εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν. | θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει, *I.*5.12-6. The Pillars of Heracles—in their quality of being a symbol for the boundary beyond which a mortal cannot pass—may be used to express a similar idea, as in *I.*4.11-3 (see my notes on lines 21-3 above, pp. 287-9).

The poet may also apply the maxim 'stick to what is near' (rather than 'seeking for what is far away') to his own poetic procedures. Thus it may be used in so-called break-off passages, serving as a justification of returning to themes that are closer to the event celebrated by his ode after a 'digression.' It may occur in transitions from a mythical narrative to the praise of the victor and his victory proper, or in transitions from a narrative dealing with foreign heroes to one about domestic ones, etc.

Examples include: οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες· | οἴκοθεν μάτευε, lines 30/1 above. Similarly, τὸ δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ ναὸς ἑλισσόμενον αἰεὶ κυμάτων | λέγεται παντὶ μάλιστα δονεῖν θυμόν, *N.*6.55-7, may be taken as bringing about the transition from the praise of Aegina's heroes from the past to the praise of the victor and his recent victory. Cf. also τὸ δ' ἐν ποσί μοι τράχον | ἴτω τεὸν χρέος, ὦ παῖ, νεώτατον καλῶν, | ἐμᾶι ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶι, *P.*8.32-4, where τὸ ἐν ποσί refers to the poet's urgent task, his encomiastic task in its narrowest sense (see my note, pp. 512/3); the self-exhortation brings about the transition from the praise of Aegina (21-8) to the praise of the victor and his family (35-8). The Pillars of Heracles may be used to express a similar idea, as in *N.*4.69-72, *O.*3.43-5. See my note on 21-3 above (pp. 287-9).

• *Literature:* On the polarity between the near and the far see C. Ramnoux, 'L'amour du lointain', *Revue de la Mediterranné* 18, 1960, 439-59; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind,* pp. 11-70. David Young, *Three Odes,* Appendix I, pp. 116-20, collected and schematized almost fifty instances

---

[294] Young surprizingly does not include *h.l.*

in Greek literature of what he calls 'the theme of the near and the far.'[294] For literature about the Pillars of Heracles and the *ne plus ultra* motif see my notes on lines 21-3 above.

• *Semantics:* Whereas **ἐνέπω** in epic is mainly used in the sense of 'telling' a story, tales, news, tidings, etc. (cf. e.g. *Od.*1.1, 4.317, 23.301, etc.), it seems in Pindar to be sematically equivalent to other verbs denoting 'saying.'

In *O.*1.86 ὣς ἔννεπεν closes off a prayer in direct speech, as ὣς ἤνεπε in *N.*10.79. Cf. also ὣς φάτο Κρονίδαις | ἐννέποιςα θεά, *I.*8.45/45a; ἔννεπε in *O.*8.41 is followed by direct speech. In *N.*1.69 the verb closes off a prophecy by Tiresias given in indirect speech. Especially in these cases the verb ἐνέπω seems to be nothing more than a conveniant metrical variant for other verbs denoting 'saying' (for speech caps see my note on *P.*8.43, p. 531). In *P.*4.242 the verb is followed by an indirect question; in *O.*1.47 by a ὅτι clause. The verb, in the sense of 'calling', governs a double accusative in *N.*6.59 and *fr.*83. For the verb, like *h.l.*, referring to the act of 'telling, bidding' someone to do so and so, cf. οὕνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀςτῶν, εἴ τις ἀντάςεις, τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶι πεποναμένον εὖ | μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἁλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω· | κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν | παντὶ θυμῶι cύν τε δίκαι καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν, *P.*9.93-6, where the verb, like *h.l.*, refers to the act of giving a prudential maxim. Cf. also ἐννέπω cὲ τῶι κηρύγματι, | ὧιπερ προεῖπας, ἐμμένειν, κἀφ' ἡμέρας | τῆς νῦν προςαυδᾶν μήτε τούςδε μήτ' ἐμέ, | ὡς ὄντι γῆς τῆςδ' ἀνοςίωι μιάςτορι, S.*OT* 350-3; ἐννέπω δὲ νῦν | τὰς παῖδας ὡς τάχιςτα δεῦρ' ἄγειν τινά, S.*OC* 932/3. For the use of εἰπεῖν and φαμί in this sense see my note on line 28 above (p. 307).

τὸ παρκείμενον is 'what lies by one,' i.e., 'what is near, present, available.'

The only other Pindaric occurrence of παράκειμαι is: (Pallas speaks to Bellerophon:) "εὕδεις Αἰολίδα βαςιλεῦ; | ἄγε φίλτρον τόδ' ἵππειον δέκευ, | καὶ Δαμαίωι νιν θύων ταῦρον ἀργάεντα πατρὶ δεῖξον." | κυάναιγις ἐν ὄρφναι | κνώςςοντί οἱ παρθένος τόςα εἰπεῖν | ἔδοξεν· ἀνὰ δ' ἔπαλτ' ὀρθῶι ποδί. παρκείμενον δὲ ςυλλαβὼν τέρας, κτλ, *O.*13.67-73; the goddess may have been just a dream, but when Bellerophon woke up the magic bridle was lying in front of him. Cf. also *Il.*24.476, *Od.*21.416, Thgn.685, Ar.*Lys.*1048, S.*Ph.*861, etc.

• *Coordination:* The phrase φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκείμενον specifies the fourth of the four ἀρεταί mentioned in the preceding sentence. Therefore it is somewhat surprizing that this clause is attached to the preceding one by means of **δ'**, marking it as if it where the next, independent step in the argument, rather than a specification of what has preceded. In prose we would certainly have expected γάρ. And τ', as equivalent to a so-called explicative καί, would also have been easy to account for. The reason why Pindar has used δ' is that he has chosen to identify the fourth ἀρετά in a new main clause. Thus the presentation mirrors the fact that the fourth ἀρετά has a

special status, that it is added as an extra consequence of the limitations given by the three other ἀρεταί. Thus we have the same connection twice: δέ in 74 introduces a next independent step in the sequence, δ' here, in 75, resumes the preceding δέ, taking the same step again.

76. τῶν οὐκ ἄπεστι

The victor has proved to possess all of the four ἀρεταί mentioned in the preceding lines. His courage and strength have won his pancration victory (cf. 15-20) and his membership of the Thearion (69/70) implies adequate mental capacities (cf. also ἀγορά, line 14). See further interpretation, pp. 219/20.

•*Litotes:* If *litotes* is defined as affirmation by denial, i.e.,—in encomiastic terms—attribution of a laudable quality to the object of praise by denying the opposite,[295] the figure of *litotes* is quite frequently applied by Pindar. The effect of the *litotes* has often been described in terms of emphasis by understatement. Disassociating the object of praise from a negative qualification implies associating him with the opposite quality *in a very high degree.* Problematic are passages like *h.l.*, and, e.g., οὐκ ἀποδάμου 'Απόλλωνος τυχόντος, *P.*4.5 (cf. also Μοῖσα δ' οὐκ ἀποδαμεῖ | τρόποις ἐπὶ σφετέροισι, *P.*10.37/8), where there is no scale, so no opportunity for superlativity (one is present or not, one cannot easily be 'extremely present').[296] It is wrong, however, to regard such instances as meaning exactly the same as their positive equivalents.[297] First, *litotes* attracts the attention of the hearer more than its positive equivalent would do. Second, a *litotes* is less explicit than its positive equivalent. It denies a negative qualification to the object of praise, thus leaving open the entire range of positive qualifications. The degree in which he possesses them is left to the interpretation of the audience.[298] Notions that do not lend themselves for scalar presentation are thus emphasised by understatement too (one could paraphrase the effect in *P.*4.5 as 'presence without a doubt', or the like).

Examples include: Καδμεῖοί νιν οὐκ ἀέκοντες ἄνθεσι μείγνυον, *N.*4.21 (cf. *fr.*169.52); οὐκ ἄγνωτ' ἀείδω | 'Ισθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν, *I.*2.12/3; οὔτε παγκάρπων φυτῶν νάποινον οὔτ' ἀγνῶτα θηρῶν, *P.*9.58; ἔνθα μοι ἁρμόδιον | δεῖπνον κεκόσμηται, θαμὰ δ' ἀλλοδαπῶν | οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι | ἐντί, *N.*1.21-4; χάρμα

---

[295] *Litotes* may be adequately defined in the words of Gellius: *laudatio non virtutibus appellandis, sed vitiis detrahendis,* 3.6.11.

[296] Thus Braswell on *P.*4.5 (p. 67) *contra* Köhnken, *Glotta* 54, 1976, 66.

[297] As Braswell (*loc. cit.*) does: "I see no difference between saying οὐκ ἀποδαμεῖ and ἐπιδαμεῖ."

[298] Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, p. 78: "Die Litotes ist eine Art fishing, sie nötigt den Hörer, von sich aus zu dem Gesagten etwas hinzuzutun und hat dadurch etwas Unausgedrücktes, Gedämpftes, Anregendes, Beunruhigendes, Spornendes, Kitzelndes."

δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος, *P.*1.59; ὁ μέγας δὲ κίνδυνος ἄναλκιν οὐ φῶτα λαμβάνει, *O.*1.81 (cf. *fr.*342); οὐκ ἐμέμφθη | ῥυςίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός, *I.*2.20/1 (probably also ἐὼν δ' ἐγγὺς Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεταί μ' ἀνὴρ | Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἁλὸς οἰκέων, *N.*7.64/5[299]); ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως | παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν. ἔγνον ποτὰ καὶ Ἰόλαον | οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντά νιν ἑπτάπυλοι Θῆβαι, *P.*9.78-80; νόωι δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει, | ἄδικον οὔθ' ὑπέροπλον ἥβαν δρέπων, σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖςι Πιερίδων, *P.*6.47-9; ἥβαν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρον ὑπὸ χειᾶι {πω} καλῶν δάμασεν, *I.*8.70; cf. also expressions like οὐκ κατελέγχει, quoted in my notes on lines 14-7 above. A double *litotes* occurs in: ὔμμιν, ὦ Μοῖσαι, φυγόξεινον στρατὸν | μήτ' ἀπείρατον καλῶν | ἀκρόσοφόν τε καὶ αἰχματὰν ἀφίξεσθαι, *O.*11.17-9; cf. also καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι | οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, | οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν, *I.*2.30-2. With οὐχ ἑκάς: ἔπεσε δ' οὐ Χαρίτων ἑκὰς | ἁ δικαιόπολις ἀρεταῖς | κλειναῖςιν Αἰακιδᾶν | θιγοῖςα νᾶςος, *P.*8.21-4. With οὐκ ἄτερ: οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, *P.*5.76, *O.*8.45, etc. With οὐκ ἄνευ: ἔνθα πεῖραν ἔχοντες οἴκαδε κλυτοκάρπων | οὐ νέοντ' ἄνευ στεφάνων, *N.*4.76/7. With *alpha privans:* ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακγόρους, *O.*1.53. 'Reverse' *litotes*: μακρὸν οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν ὄλβον, *P.*2.26.

On *litotes* in Pindar see further Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, pp. 77/8; Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 510, n. 18; Gerber on *O.*1.53 (p. 90); A. Köhnken, 'Gebrauch und Funktion der Litotes bei Pindar', *Glotta* 54, 1976, 62-67; Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 77/8.

• *Coordination:* If **τῶν** is taken as a demonstrative,[300] the asyndeton may be understood, as the demonstrative already adequaltely defines the relation of this sentence to the precedding context. See Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 41 (§ 12.2).

• *Text:* The MSS. read ἄπεστι. Bergk's conjecture ἄπεςςι—surprizingly adopted by Christ, Mezger and by Wilamowitz (p. 279, n. 2) with great enthusiam and printed in the text of Snell-Maehler—is unnecessary, as Farnell *ad loc.* (pp. 261/2) argues. Similar shifts between the second and third person occur in *N.*5.43-6 (see my notes *ad loc.*). Here such a shift is quite effective as the victor is going to be spoken to in the second person in the following lines, which dedicate the ode as a whole to him (cf. Dissen *ad* χαῖρε, p. 390: "recte vero nunc mutatur persona, quum intentior fiat oratio").

---

[299] See Carey *ad loc.* (p. 162). Cf. also A.*Eu.*1020; E.*Hel.*636, *IA* 712, *Phoen.*425.

[300] The alternative would be to regard it as a relative pronoun, referring to τέσσαρας ἀρετάς (74), which would make φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκείμενον (75) a parenthesis. This is not impossible (cf. the parenthesis with δ' in line 78), but perhaps somewhat far-fetched. In any case, with a relative connection asyndeton is in Pindar the normal situation.

76-80

Greetings. As a friend friend I send you this mixture of honey with white milk— mingling dew is spread on it —, a drink of song on the Aeolian breath of pipes, late though it be.

76-80. Structure and Word Order

The greeting χαῖρε triggers a fresh beginning. The following asyndeton is what is to be expected after such a new start; emphatically preposed φίλος ἐγώ introduces a passage in which the poet makes statements about his own poetic conduct (for the punctuation see below). The phrase φίλος ἐγὼ τόδε τοι πέμπω could be, theoretically, complete in itself, the poet stating that he sends this current ode to the victor. τόδε, then, is further specified by a metaphorical description of what kind of ode the poet is sending. It is μεμιγμένον μέλι. Preposed μεμιγμένον anticipates a second ingredient with which the honey is mixed: λευκῶι cὺν γάλακτι. The hyperbaton gives relief to λευκῶι, especially since cύν is syntactically superfluous. The effect of this is that the 'radiance', the visual qualities of the milk are emphasized.

Then, with γάλακτι the sentence is syntactically complete once again. A third ingredient is mentioned in a new main clause, connected to the preceding one with δ', which characterizes it as a next step in the description. This sentence, κιρναμένα δ' ἔερc' ἀμφέπει, is unusual for its choice of words and word order. The marked position before δ' is, surprizingly, taken by κιρναμένα. ἐέρcα is a relatively rare and poetic noun; the elision of the long final vocal is irregular. The metaphorical usage of the verb ἀμφέπει is striking. All this adds to the impression of the cocktail being a very special one.

Then, πόμ' ἀοίδιμον is an apposition to the entire preceding complex. Syntactically πόμ' ἀοίδιμον stands on a par with the object of πέμπω in line 77 (i.e., with μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῶι | cὺν γάλακτι, 77/8), in spite of the fact that a new main clause has intervened in line 78. In other words, κιρναμένα δ' ἔερc' ἀμφέπει (78) is a parenthesis, but the hearer realizes this only when he hears πόμ' ἀοίδιμον in line 79,—or, rather, only as late as with ἔcτι δ' in line 80, since πόμ' ἀοίδιμον could, theoretically, be the first words of new, asyndetic main clause, which possibility is ruled out when a new main clause starts in line 80 without any finite verb having passed after πόμ' ἀοίδιμον.

For this type of parenthesis (having δέ) one may compare: θραcείαι δὲ πνέων καρδίαι | μόλεν Δανάαc ποτὲ παῖc, ἀγεῖτο δ' 'Αθάνα, | ἐc ἀνδρῶν μακάρων ὅμιλον, *P.*10.44-6. In this case, however, the parenthesis is easier to be grasped as such, since the sentence is not complete yet at the point where the parenthesis is inserted; one would like to know where Peleus went. Moreover, the parenthesis itself needs the same complement.

The phrase Αἰολίϲϲιν ἐν πνοαῖϲιν αὐλῶν (79) is an attributive adjunct to πόμ', further elaborating upon the 'song-character' of the drink. Then, ὀψέ περ in 80 is a postponed adverbial adjunct to πέμπω in line 77. The rather striking postponement of this adverbial phrase gives it great emphasis.[301]

76. χαῖρε· φίλοϲ ...

•*Punctuation:* All modern editors take φίλοϲ as a nominative *pro vocativo*, punctuating: χαῖρε, φίλοϲ· ἐγὼ τόδε τοι | πέμπω κτλ. (thus Snell-Maehler, Bowra, Sandys, Christ). On the one hand, there is reason to challange this generally accepted punctuation: since Pindar himself did not punctuate, and manuscriptal evidence just mirrors the interpretation of a scribe or, at best, of a scribal tradition, consequently having no higher status than any interpretation, there is no signal whatsoever for not taking φίλοϲ with ἐγώ, which strongly plead in favour of taking the nominative simply as a nominative, qualifying ἐγώ.[302] χαῖρε occurs twice more in the extant works of Pindar, both times without explicit address (see below). On the other hand, there is no parallel for Pindar calling himself a φίλοϲ of the victor. So the choice is whether to interpret and punctuate contrary to the most natural option *h.l.*, or contrary to usual procedures elsewhere in Pindar. The latter is more preferable by far, which becomes evident if we place ourselves in the perspective of Pindar's audience rather than in the situation of the scholar who weighs out parallels. Punctuating χαῖρε, φίλοϲ· presupposes that the audience would favour the syntactically more anomalous option, guided, as it were, by an awareness that Pindar has never called himself a φίλοϲ before, for other audiences. They have only these words to go by and will certainly interpret them in the most natural way, thoughts about a *nominativus pro vocativo* not even crossing their minds.

Pindaric parallels to a nominative used instead of a vocative are rare and disputable: Κάδμου κόραι, Ϲεμέλα μὲν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀγυιᾶτιϲ, | Ἰνὼ δὲ Λευκοθέα ποντιᾶν ὁμοθάλαμε Νηρηΐδων, *P.*11.1/2, where Christ conjectured the vocative ἀγυιᾶτι, and where Ἰνώ looks like a nominative (but see Kambylis); τίν τ', Ἐλέλιχθον, ἄρχειϲ ὃϲ ἱππιᾶν ἐϲόδων, | μάλα ἁδόντι νόῳ, Ποϲειδάν, προϲέρχεται, *P.*6.50/1, where Ποϲειδάν seems to be a nominative (cf. *O.*1.26, *O.*8.31, *O.*9.31, *I.*8.27; the vocative Ποϲείδαον oc-

[301] This aspect is reinforced by the enjambed position at the beginning of the epode. On such enjambments in general see now S.R. Slings, 'Metrical Unit and Information Unit', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999.

[302] Contrast: ὦ φίλε, *P.*1.92, addressing the victor; ὦ φίλοι, *P.*11.38, in a break-off passage, addressing his (Theban!) audience.

curs in *O.*1.75; but see Kambylis); ὦ Φίντις, *O.*6.22. See further: R. Loewe, 'Der Nominativ für den Vokativ im Indogermanischen', *ZVS* 55, 1927, 38-74 & 199-237; R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichterspache*, pp. 269 ff.; Kambylis, *Anredeformen*, pp. 137/8; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 73 (§ 66).

The vocative φίλος does occur in Homer: αἲ γὰρ δὴ οὕτως εἴη, φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε, *Il.*4.189; ἀλλ', φίλος, θάνε καὶ σύ, *Il.*21.106, etc. Note that, unlike *h.l.*, there can be no doubt whatsoever that φίλος is a vocative. The audience is led to accept the syntactically more anomalous option by the fact that there is no alternative.

The function of the poet's presenting himself as a φίλος of the victor is comparable to those passage where he emphasizes that he is performing his encomiastic tasks out of his own free will (for the poet's willingness to praise the victor, see my note on *P.*8.67, p. 555). In fact, taking φίλος to refer to Pindar himself increases the emphasis: the φιλία motif gains in force.[303]

The greeting **χαῖρε** triggers a fresh beginning.[304] The original denotation of the verb χαίρειν may shine through: see interpretation, p. 220.

χαῖρε here has been interpreted as a formula of goodbye, closing off the *epinicion*. The remaining eight verses have consequently been regarded as some kind of epilogue.[305] The following passage has been adduced as a parallel to this: χαῖρε· τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολὰν | μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται, *P.*2.67/8, closing off the passage in which the victor is being praised (57-67); after this some thirty lines follow, entirely gnomic, in which the victor is not mentioned anymore. This induced scholars to regard the remaining thirty lines as some kind of epilogue, χαῖρε meaning 'farewell' and closing off the *epinicion* proper.[306] But χαῖρε is a general formula of greeting, not exclusively associated with leave-taking so as to impart to the audience that the poem is coming to an end. For χαῖρε at meeting cf. *Il.*9.197, *Od.*13.229, etc.; at leave-taking: *Od.*5.205, 13.59, 15.151, etc. It is preferable to interpret χαῖρε as 'hail!,' triggering a fresh beginning and introducing a new section of the poem.[307] For *I.*1.28-34, see my note on 76 ἐγώ below. The scholion counts with the possibility of χαῖρε being a toast, 'cheers!'[308] This interpretation derives its attractiveness from the fact that the poet offers a (metaphorical) drink in the fol-

---

[303] For the φιλία motif cf. *P.*1.92, *P.*4.1. For references to the *xenia* between poet and victor, cf. *O.*1.11ff., *P.*3.69, *P.*10.64ff., *N.*1.19ff., *N.*7.61, *I.*2.48. For Pindar presenting himself as related to the victor, cf. *I.*1.1.ff., *I.*7.31ff., cf. also *O.*6.84ff., *I.*8.16ff., *I.*5.20, *I.*6.19ff. See esp. Carey, *Passionate Intellect*, pp. 92-6.

[304] For an *apostrophe* marking a new beginning cf. θυμέ, line 26 above, *N.*5.48 ἴσθι.

[305] Thus Christ *ad loc.*,

[306] Christ *ad loc.* (p. 132) remarks: "χαῖρε· hac formula hic et *N.*3.76 de carmine epinicio ad finem perducto decedit, valere virum laudatum iubens, ut in fine epistolarum et elogiorum facere solebant. Similiter autem poeta in hoc carmine atque in carmine *P.*1 encomio perfecto suam causam in epilogo agit." Thus also Stoneman, *CQ* 26, 1976, 194.

[307] Thus Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 47 (on *P.*2.67).

lowing lines. χαῖρε is used at meals in *Od.*4.60, 18.122. For a discussion of the greeting from the perspective of historical and comparative linguistics see now: Wachter, R., 'Griechisch χαῖρε: Vorgeschichte eines Grußwortes', *MH* 55, 1998, 65-75.

76-79. The cocktail of song. Analysis of the imagery

The information Pindar wants to convey is that he his sending this ode, the one that is currently being sung, to the victor, and that it is a very special ode. This is the *tenor* of the passage. The words belonging to the terminology of the *tenor* are ἐγὼ τόδε τοι πέμπω ... ἀοίδιμον and what follows. The vehicles are μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῶι cὺν γάλακτι, κιρναμένα δ' ἔερc' ἀμφέπει, πόμ', borrowed from culinary terminology, the *suppressed tenor* being something like 'special song.' The *ground* is two-fold. First, both the song and the drink are enjoyable for the victor, both 'refresh' him, so to speak, after the hardships of training and contest.[309] Second, Pindar's ode and this special drink have in common that they are made up out of a number of different elements that are all enjoyable in themselves.[310]

The metaphorical description of 'this ode that is now being sung' as a 'mixture of honey with milk and dew' aims at giving the impression of the song being something very special and extraordinary, a unique and newly invented cocktail of delicious ingredients. See interpretation, pp. 220/1, and my note on line 78 below (p. 404).

The qualification ἀοίδιμον (79) 'soothens' the metaphor, by explicitly relating the *vehicle* πόμ' to the *tenor* 'song'. Thus ἀοίδιμον prevents the audience from missing the link between the *vehicles* and the *tenor*. This may have become desirable, since the metaphor runs away from convention as it proceeds. τόδε (76) may also be said to soothen the metaphor, since the deictic element relates the *vehicles* it governs to what may be called 'this' from the perspective of the audience, which makes it easier for them to make the link between the cocktail and the ode that is currently being sung.

For this procedure of 'soothening' a metaphor it is illustrative to compare ὦ Θραcύβουλ', ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' ἀοιδᾶν | τοῦτο ⟨τοι⟩ πέμπω μεταδόρπιον, *fr.*124.1/2, where both the qualification ἀοιδᾶν and τοῦτο (and perhaps also to some degree μεταδόρπιον) explicitly relate the *vehicle* ὄχημ' to the *tenor* 'song.'

One must not attempt to connect each of the three ingredients of

---

[308] Σ. 132a (III 60 Dr.): ἐπεὶ ἴcωc οἱ προπίνοντεc ἔλεγον τὸ χαῖρε, ὡc τὸ χαῖρ' Ἀχιλεῦ (cf. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόcιοc καὶ ἐδητύοc ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο, | νεῦc' Αἴαc Φοίνικι · νόηcε δὲ δῖοc Ὀδυccεύc, | πληcάμενοc δ' οἴνοιο δέπαc δείδεκτ' Ἀχιλῆα · | "χαῖρ', Ἀχιλεῦ · κτλ", *Il.*9.222/5). Thus also Bury *ad loc.* (p. 60), Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 27.

[309] For the remedial powers of song, cf. esp. the opening lines of *N.*4; see further my notes on lines 16-8 above (pp. 276-8) and on *P.*8.6 (pp. 474/5).

[310] For the ideal of ποικιλία see introduction, pp. 22-3.

the drink to one specific element in this ode or in Pindar's poetical practice, as it is done by the scholiast, who connects honey with the πόνοc of bees and milk with φύcιc, as it comes naturally as soon as a woman or female has given birth (Σ.134a, III 61 Dr.), so taking honey as referring to poetical technique and milk as referring to inspiration, which is quite contrary to the conventional metaphorical usage of honey (see below). I do not believe Instone either, who argued (*Eranos* 91, 1993, 28 n. 45) that "what the dew stands for is the ἀοιδή and ἀοιδή can be stirred or roused (cf. *I*.5.24/5). The μέλι-γάλα mix may imply that the narrative is a mixture of (a) sweet words of praise and (b) parts that are less directly encomiastic." The drink as a whole is one incredible mix, of various ingredients, all of them very special in themselves, and so is this ode.

•*A cocktail being a metaphor for song:* To the metaphorical description of song as a mixed drink two passages may be compared. In the opening lines of *I*.6 Pindar says that he 'mixes a bowl of the Muses' songs' for the victor: θάλλοντοc ἀνδρῶν ὡc ὅτε cυμποcίου | δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοιcαίων μελέων | κίρναμεν Λάμπωνοc εὐάθλου γενεᾶc ὕπερ ... εἴη δὲ τρίτον | cωτῆρι πορcαίνονταc Ὀλυμπίωι Αἴγιναν κάτα | cπένδειν μελιφθόγγοιc ἀοιδαῖc, *I*.6.1-3, 7-9. Cf. also ἐccὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοc ὀρθόc, | ἠϋκόμων cκυτάλα Μοιcᾶν, γλυκὺc κρατὴρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν, *O*.6.90/1. For honey as a metaphor for song see my note on μέλι, line 77 below. For less elaborate metaphors presenting song as if it were liquid see my note on *P*.8.57 (p. 546).

76. ἐγώ

As is often the case, emphatically preposed ἐγώ introduces a passage in which the poet makes statements about his own poetic conduct. Cf. e.g. *O*.7.7, *O*.8.54, *O*.9.21, *O*.10.97, *O*.13.49, *I*.1.14, 32 (*v.i.*), *I*.6.16, etc. The asyndeton is what is to be expected after a greeting that triggers a fresh beginning.

But cf.: τῶν ἀθρόοιc ἀνδηcάμενοι θαμάκιc | ἔρνεcιν χαίταc ῥεέθροιcί τε Δίρκαc ἔφανεν καὶ παρ' Εὐρώται πέλαc, | Ἰφικλέοc μὲν παῖc ὁμόδαμοc ἐὼν Cπαρτῶν γένει, | Τυνδαρίδαc δ' ἐν Ἀχαιοῖc ὑψίπεδον Θεράπναc οἰκέων ἕδοc. | χαίρετ'. ἐγὼ δὲ Ποcειδάωνι Ἰcθμῶι τε ζαθέαι | Ὀγχεcτίαιcι τ' ἀϊόνεccιν περιcτέλλων ἀοιδὰν | γαρύcομαι τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸc ἐν τιμαῖcιν ἀγακλέα τὰν Ἀcωποδώρου πατρὸc αἶcαν, *I*.1.28-34; χαίρετ' (32) is addressed to the heroes Castor and Iolaus, and it may be interpreted as 'farewell', as their role in the poem is over. The reason why the sentence following the greeting has δέ (32) may be that there is a connection between the context following upon the greeting and the one preceding it. 'Not Castor and Iolaus, then, in Thebes and Sparta—so long!—, but the victor and his father, now, in Onchestus'. The particle defines the relation with the context preceding

the greeting, χαίρετ' being an interjection. Bundy, *CSCA* 5, 1972, 52-4 argued that the pattern χαίρετ'· ἐγὼ δέ has its origin in the rhapsodic hymn.

76-77. τοι | πέμπω

For πέμπω referring to the poet 'sending' his ode to its commisioner, cf. *O.*7.8, *O.*9.25, *fr.*124.2, cf. also *P.*2.68. Here τοι is a dative second person personal pronoun, referring to the victor. τοι must be a pronoun due to the valency of the verb πέμπω. In order to produce effective communication, this verb needs three complements to it (subject, object, and a reference to the place or person to which or whom something is being sent). Since τοι is a candidate to fill the third place, while no other candidate is available, it must be interpreted as a reference to the person to whom the cocktail of song is being sent. Cf. ὦ Θραcύβουλ', ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' ἀοιδᾶν | τοῦτο ⟨τοι⟩ πέμπω μεταδόρπιον, *fr.*124.1/2. Contrast: χθόνα τοί ποτε καὶ cτρατὸν ἀθρόον | πέμψαν κεραυνῶι τριόδοντί τε | ἐc τὸν βαθὺν Τάρταρον, *Pae.*4.42-4, where τοι must be a particle because the third place is occupied by ἐc τὸν βαθὺν Τάρταρον. For πέμπω with a dative, cf. *O.*7.8, *N.*9.52, etc.

For the particle τοι see my note on *N.*5.48 (appendix, pp. 611-3). For the distribution of τοι and cοι on euphonic grounds, see my remarks on the distribution of τύ and cύ in my note on *N.*5.41 (pp. 168/9).

77, 78. μεμιγμένον, κιρναμένα

It has often been said that the difference between both verbs resides in the fact that with μείγνυμι one produces a mixture in which the ingredients are still separately discernable as such, while with κεράννυμι one gets a complete blending of the ingredients.[311] However, in actual usage little difference between both verbs can be detected in this respect.

Both verbs are used of diluting wine with water in a κρατήρ (κεράννυμι, *Il.*4.260, *Od.*3.393, 18.423, 20.253, 24.364, etc; μείγνυμι, *Od.*1.110, etc.). In *Il.*3.270 the verb μείγνυμι refers to the mixing together of Trojan and Greek wine. In τυποῦcιν αὐτὰ (*sc.* θνητὰ γένη) θεοὶ γῆc ἔνδον ἐκ γῆc καὶ πυρὸc μείξαντεc καὶ τῶν ὅcα πυρὶ καὶ γῆι κεράννυται, Pl.*Prt.*320d, application of Aristotle's theory would mean that water and air are blends of fire and earth[312] in which fire and earth are not separately discernable, while the mortal races are moulded by mixing all four elements which remain to be seperately discernable in the creatures. This is not impossible. However, it seems by far more likely that the precise process of creation is

---

[311] Thus, e.g., LSJ *s.v.* κρᾶcιc. Cf. also Arist.*Top.*122b26, *Stoic.*2.153.

[312] See Adam & Adam *ad loc.*

intentionally left vague and that different verbs are used for stylistic reasons (Protagoras is portrayed by Plato as using a highly sophisticated style; in the sententence cited cf. the poetical postposition ἔνδον and the chiasm).

This is especially the case in Pindar, who has a penchant for all sorts of metaphorical usages of these verbs (cf. introduction, pp. 30-2). Here, where the verbs are used in their literal sense, the supposed difference between the two is not relevant either. When you mix honey with milk you get one substance in which the seperate ingredients are not separately discernable, and when you mix dew into it this is still the case.

μείγνυμι is the more frequent and less specific verb of both, having a wider range of metaphorical senses: it may be used in the sense of 'joining' (people on the battlefield, in their house, etc.), of 'making' people 'aquainted' with misery, death, etc., of 'bringing' someones head 'into contact' with the dust, of sexual intercourse, and the like. κεράννυμι is used almost exclusively in its literal sense (literal at least on the level of the *vehicle*), of mixing or blending substances. Also in Pindar μείγνυμι is the more frequent of both (occurring 32 times, against 9 occurrences of κίρναμι).

For κίρναμι used literal of mixing liquids, cf. θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὅτε συμποσίου | δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων | κίρναμεν Λάμπωνος εὐάθλου γενεᾶς ὕπερ, *I.*6.1-3. Ironically, *h.l.* is the only occurrence in Pindar of μείγνυμι used in its literal sense, though within a metaphor (i.e., literal on the level of the *vehicle*).

77. μέλι

Honey, being the sweet product *par excellence*, is a suitable metaphor for anything pleasant, especially for what is pleasant to the ears, such as song, poetry, or well-spoken words. It may be associated with prophecy (because bees are) and with the divine world.

• *Honey as an image for poetry:* Speech that it is a pleasure to listen to—such as extraordinary well formulated speeches, or good poetry—is often compared to honey, ever since τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ | ἡδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε, λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής, | τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή, *Il.*1.247-9.[313] Pindar compares his own odes to honey in: ἐγὼ δὲ συναπτόμενος σπουδᾶι, κλυτὸν ἔθνος | Λοκρῶν ἀμφέπεσον, μέλιτι | εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβρέχων, *O.*10.97-99, where μέλι is a metaphor for the ode that is currently being sung. Cf. also ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῶι | μέλιτι καὶ τοιαίδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον χάρμ' ἀγαπάζοντι,

---

[313] In γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν | μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον, *O.*6.52-4, Thrasybulus' sociable character is compared to honey.

*I.*5.53/4; ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] | γλῶςςα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν [⏑⏑––][314], *Pae.*6.58/9; μελιςςοτεύκτων κηρίων ἐμὰ γλυκερώτερος ὀμφά, *fr.*152. Perhaps similarly *fr.*97. Cf. also τῶι μὲν ἐπὶ γλώςςηι γλυκερὴν χείουςιν ἐέρςην (*sc.* the Muses), | τοῦ δ' ἔπε' ἐκ ςτόματος ῥεῖ μείλιχα, Hes.*Th.*83/4 (see my note on ἔερς' below); Pl.*Ion* 534a/b. Nectar is a metaphor of song and a 'gift of the Muses' in: καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοιcᾶν δόςιν, ἀεθλοφόροις | ἀνδράςιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, | ἱλάςκομαι | Ὀλυμπίαι Πυθοῖ τε νικώντεςςιν, *O.*7.7-10.

Cf. also μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι, *O.*11.4, *P.*3.64, *I.*2.3, cf. also *Pae.*5.57; μελιγαρύων ... κώμων, line 4 above; μελιγδούποιςι ... ἀοιδαῖς, *N.*11.18; μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν, *I.*2.32; μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδαῖς, *I.*6.9; μελίφθογγοι ... Μοῖςαι, *O.*6.21; μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας, *I.*2.7; and passages where Pindar calls his song γλυκύς (such as γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά, *N.*5.2; see my note *ad loc.*). Cf. also μελίγηρυν ... ὄπ', *Od.*12.187, Simon.41, etc.

The special talents of the classical poets are in later times often explained by means of stories about bees swarming around the cradle of the new born poet, putting honey in his mouth. Such a story is told about Pindar (Philostrat.*Im.*2.12; cf. Paus.9.23.2), and a similar one about Plato (Plin.*NH* 11.55, Cic.*Div.*1.36.78, 2.31.66). Sophocles seems to have been called a bee in the old comedy (Σ. on S.*OC* 17 and *Aj.*1199).

As the poet's words are like honey, he is himself a bee. Pindar compares his own way of handling themes in his odes with a bee caring only for the best part of a flower and then hoovering on to the next one: ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων | ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλιςςα θύνει λόγον, *P.*10.53/4. That the result of this is honey is naturally implied. Cf. also Pl.*Ion* 534a/b. Cf. also Ar.*Av.*749, Hor.*C.*4.2.27 ff., Lucian.*Pisc.*6, etc.

Honey is sometimes connected with mantic practices. In *O.*6.43-51 Pindar tells us that Iamus was nurtured with honey by snakes[315]; he became a distinguished seer. Likewise, the three sisters on Mount Parnassus, who foretell the future, the Θριαί, are said to fly hither and thither to feed themselves with honey; when they have eaten enough of it, they will tell the truth, otherwise they will speak confused (*h.Herm.*558-63). Pindar calls the Pythia χρηςμὸς μελίςςας Δελφίδος, *P.*4.60. Cf. also Pl.*Ion* 534b.

Honey is sometimes said to be the food of the gods (Porphyrius, *De Antro Nymph.* 16).[316] Callimachus (*Hymn to Zeus* 48) reports that Zeus was nurtured with milk and honey. The same is said about Dionysus (A.R.4.1131/2). And Chiron is reported to have raised Achilles on milk, marrow and honey (Philostrat.*Im.*2.2). There is a magical papyrus giving

---

[314] καταλείβειν Wilamowitz: καταχεῦαι Kamerbeek, *alii alia.*

[315] For snakes as a mantic symbol, cf. *P.*8.46 with the scholia *ad loc.* (63a, 66a Dr.).

[316] In connection with initiation in the Mithras cult.

the following advise: καὶ λαβὼν τὸ γάλα cὺν τῶι [μέλι]τι ἀπόπιε πρὶν ἀνατολῆc ἡλίου, καὶ ἔcται τι ἔνθεον ἐν τῆι cῆι καρδίαι.[317]

• *Literature:* W.H. Roscher, *Nektar und Ambrosia*, Leipzig 1883; Usener, 'Milch und Honig', *Rh.M.* N.F. 57, 1902, 177 ff.; K. Wyss, *Die Milch im Kultus der Griechen und Römer*, 1914, pp. 40 ff. See also "die mit hingebendem Fleiß gefertigte Schrift eines Imkers" W. Robert-Tornow, *De apium mellisque apud veteres significatione*, Berlin 1893. For honey and bees in connection with poets and prophets see also A.B. Cook, *JHS* 15, 1985, 1-24; West on Hes.*Th.*83 (p. 183); and esp. J.H. Waszink, *Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und der Dichting in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Opladen 1974. On the miraculous milk and honey making in the cult of Dionysus, see also C. Bonner, 'Dionysiac Magic', *TAPhA* 41, 1911, 175 ff.; Dodds on E.*Bacch.*704-11; W.F. Otto, *Dionysos: Mythos und Kultus*, 1933, pp. 91/2. For the conceptual link between 'honey' and 'dew' see esp. Hes.*Th.*83 with West *ad loc.* (cited in my note on ἔερϲ', line 78 below) and Conington on Verg.*G.*4.1.

78. λευκῶι cὺν γάλακτι

The mixture of milk and honey is a well-known recipe. In fact, some sources give rise to the suspicion that Greeks did not dare drink their milk without some honey having been added.

Cf. ἀμέλγουcι γὰρ (*sc.* Ἰνδοὶ) περιγλύκιcτον γάλα καὶ οὐ δέονται ἀναμίξαι αὐτῶι μέλι, ὅπερ οὖν δρῶcιν Ἕλληνες, Aelian.*NA* 7 (cit. Bury). The scholiast on our line here even considers milk to be useless without honey (οἷον ὡc τὸ γάλα τῶι μέλιτι μιχθὲν χρηcτὸν γίνεται, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ποίημα τοῖc αὐλοῖc ἐγκραθὲν προcηνὲc γίνεται, 135, III 61 Dr.).[318] Cf. also Hp.*Aff.*6.18, 25.14, etc. Milk mixed with honey was used as a libation to the powers of the nether world. Then it may be called μελίκρητον. Cf. ἀμφ' αὐτῶι δὲ χοὴν χεῖcθαι πᾶcιν νεκύεccιν, | πρῶτα μελικρήτωι, μετέπειτα δὲ ἡδέι οἴνωι, | τὸ τρίτον αὖθ' ὕδατι· ἔπι δ' ἄλφιτα λευκὰ παλύνειν, *Od.*10.518-20 (11.26-8); ἐλθοῦcα δ' ἀμφὶ τὸν Κλυταιμνήcτρας τάφον | μελίκρατ' ἄφες γάλακτος οἰνωπόν τ' ἄχνην, E.*Or.*114/5; cf. also *SIG* 1025.34 (Cos). In A.*Pers.*611-8 Atossa brings milk, honey and water to Darius' grave, together with wine, olive-oil, and flowers, in order to raise him from the deads. Cf. also the νηφάλια μειλίγματα, A.*Eu.*107, which are offerings to the Eumenides. A μελίκρητον may, however, also be a mixture of honey and water, as in Hp.*Aph.*5.41, Arist.*Metaph.*1029^{b}29, etc. For milk in combination with honey in Bacchic contexts and in connection with the Golden Age see esp. Usener, Bonner, Dodds Otto, cited in the preceding note. For the symbolic values of milk and honey in Jewish and Christian religion see Usener, *Rh.M.* 57, 1902, pp. 180-195.

---

[317] Published by Parthey, *Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad.* 1865, p. 120, 20/1; cit. Usener, *RhM* 57, 1902, p. 192 n. 59.

[318] The scholiast seems to be—needlessly, to my mind—inclined to linking each single ingredient of the cocktail to a specific detail in the context. See my general note on this passage above.

This is the only instance in Pindar of the verb μείγνυμι being construed with **cύν**. In the vast majority of passages it goes with a dative, without any preposition (both active and passive). It is construed with ἐν in *P.*4.251, *O.*1.91, and *I.*2.29 (all three with passive forms of the verb).

For the construction with cύν cf. τί γὰρ βροτῶν ἂν cὺν κακοῖc μεμιγμένων | θνήιcκειν ὁ μέλλων τοῦ χρόνου κέρδοc φέροι; S.*El.*1485/6.

For **λευκὸν** γάλα cf. *fr.*166.3, *Il.*4.434, etc. The hyperbaton gives relief to λευκῶι, especially since cύν is syntactically superfluous. Moreover, the qualification is pleonastic. Apparently, the 'whiteness' of the milk is emphasized. The effect of this may be that the milk is presented as 'white' with the specific connotation of 'radiant, bright, clear.' Light is a recurrent positive image in this ode (see my notes on δέδορκεν φάοc, line 84 below, and on ψεφηνόc, line 41 above).

For light being 'white' (and therefore pleasant and beautiful) cf., e.g., οὔτ' ἀνέμοιcι τινάccεται (*sc.* Olympos) οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρωι | δεύετεαι οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη | πέπταται ἀννέφελοc, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη· | τῶι ἔνι τέρπονται μάκαρεc θεοὶ ἤματα πάντα, *Od.*6.43-6; χάριc δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή. | κρηδέμνωι δ' ἐφύπερθε καλύψατο δῖα θεάων | καλῶι νηγατέωι· λευκὸν δ' ἦν ἠέλιοc ὥc, *Il.*14.183-5; νῦν αὖ, | νῦν, ὦ Ζεῦ, πάρα λευκὸν εὐάμερον πελάcαι φάοc | θοᾶν ὠκυάλων νεῶν, S.*Aj.*706-10; καὶ λευκὸν ἦμαρ νυκτὸc ἐκ μελαγχίμου, A.*Pers.*301. For the 'whiteness' of the object, to which the song is compared, being emphasized, perhaps with similar implications, cf.: εἰ δέ τοι | μάτρωι μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύειc | cτάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν κτλ, *N.*4.79-81.

78. κιρναμένα δ' ἐέρc' ἀμφέπει

'Mingling dew is spread on it.' A parenthesis: see my general note above (pp. 395/6). The sentence is unusual with respect to word-choise and word-order. The marked position before δ' is, surprisingly, taken by κιρναμένα. ἐέρcα, 'dew,' is a very special kind of water, originating from heaven and having a wholesome effect upon the vegetation. ἐέρcα is a relatively rare and poetic noun; the elision of the long final vocal is irregular. It is one more, very special, ingredient to the cocktail of song. The association with growth ties in with nurturing aspects of poet and poetry. The metaphorical usage of the verb ἀμφέπει is striking. It refers to the dew 'being all over' the mixture of milk and honey, 'dressing' it and even 'taking care' of it, since the dew adds to the quality of the mixture. All this adds to the impression of the cocktail being a very special one.

•*Dew as an image for song:* The noun ἐέρcα is not elsewhere used by Pindar in a context describing his songs. The noun δρόcοc, however,

which also means 'dew,'[319] does occur twice in such a context: μεγαλᾶν δ' ἀρετᾶν | δρόσωι μαλθακᾶι ῥανθεῖcαν κώμων {θ'} ὑπὸ χεύμαcιν, *P.*5.98-100; τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ πάτραν Χαρίτων | ἄρδοντι καλλίcται δρόcωι, *I.*6.63/4, *sc.* the victor, his brother, and his uncle, by means of their victories. The metaphorical usage of the verb ῥαίνω, 'besprinkle,' ties in with the metaphor of song as water: ὔμμε τ', ὦ χρυcάρματοι Αἰακίδαι, | τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ cαφέcτατον ἔμμεν | τάνδ' ἐπιcτείχοντα νᾶcον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαιc, *I.*6.19-21; χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸc | Ἀλκμᾶνα cτεφάνοιcι βάλλω, ῥαίνω δὲ καὶ ὕμνωι, *P.*8.56/7 (with my note, p. 546).

• *Semantics:* For the verbs κίρναμι and μείγνυμι see my note on μεμιγμένον in the preceding line. The noun **ἐέρcα** means 'dew.' Since dew was considered to originate from heaven, the noun may metaphorically refer to "any liquid distilled from heaven,"[320] specified by the context. Thus, ἐέρcη falling out of clouds is 'rain,' 'dew of the sea' is 'sea-water,' and 'sweet dew' is 'honey.'[321]

Cf. ἀ δ' ⟨ἐ⟩έρcα κάλα κέχυται τεθάλαιcι δὲ βρόδα κἄπαλ' ἄνθρυcκα καὶ μελίλωτοc ἀνθεμώδηc, Sappho *fr.*96.12-4 V., a description of the night; τοῖο (*sc.* Μενελάου) δὲ θυμὸc | ἰάνθη, ὡc εἴ τε περὶ cταχύεccιν ἐέρcη | ληίου ἀλδήcκοντοc, ὅτε φρίccουcιν ἄρουραι, | ὣc ἄρα coί, Μενέλαε, μετὰ φρεcὶ θυμὸc ἰάνθη, *Il.*23.597-600, where dew is presented as having a favourable effect upon the growth of the crops; the wholesome effect of the dew is used as a simile to Menelaus' mood changing from anger towards Antilochus (cf. lines 566-85) to consideration and courtesy to Antilochus' profit. Athena describes Ithaca as αἰεὶ δ' ὄμβροc ἔχει τεθαλυῖά τ' ἐέρcη· | αἰγίβοτοc δ' ἀγαθὴ καὶ βούβοτοc, *Od.*13.245/6, 'with abundant dew,' so as to be fertile. For the noun (in plural) referring to rain, cf. ἔπι δὲ νεφέλην ἕccαντο | καλὴν χρυcείην, cτιλπναὶ δ' ἀπέπιπτον ἔερcαι, *Il.*14.350/1; cf. also ἐν δὲ κυδοιμὸν | ὦρcε κακὸν Κρονίδηc, κατὰ δ' ὑψόθεν ἧκεν ἐέρcαc | αἵματι μυδαλέαc ἐξ αἰθέροc, οὕνεκ' ἔμελλεν | πολλὰc ἰφθίμουc κεφαλὰc Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν, *Il.*11.52-5, of showers of blood as a sign of the upcoming horrors. The plural in itself may be an indication that the noun refers to 'rain.' If this is true, it refers to rain also in: ἀΐccει δ' ἀρετά, χλωραῖc ἐέρcαιc ὡc ὅτε δένδρεον ⟨— | ἐν⟩ cοφοῖc ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖc' ἐν δικαίοιc τε πρὸc ὑγρὸν | αἰθέρα, *N.*8.40-2, although 'dew' is not impossible here. In Μοῖcά τοι | κολλᾶι χρυcὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἁμᾶ | καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίαc

[319] The scholiast on this line in fact paraphrases ἐέρcα with δρόcoc.

[320] West on Hes.*Th.*83 (p. 183).

[321] I see no reason whatsoever to think that the noun could mean 'froth', as it is taken by Mezger, Bury, Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 37: "'The froth of the stirring enfolds it.' The ingredients are blended by brisk stirring which produces such a froth as to surmount the brim and overflow." Brisk stirring indeed.) and Slater *s.v.* (p. 148). "Whether they have experimented with these ingredients and (if so) how much foam they produced, is not recorded; none accrued to me on a day of early summer in Canada" (Norwood, *Pindar*, p. 267).

ὑφελοῖς' ἐέρσας, *N.*7.77-9, ἐέρσα metaphorically refers to sea-water, as the qualification ποντίας makes explicit (cf. phrases like δρόσος ποντία, ἐναλία, θαλασσία, A.*Eu.*904, E.*IT* 255, 1192). In τῶι μὲν ἐπὶ γλώσσηι γλυκερὴν χείουσιν ἐέρσην (*sc.* the Muses), | τοῦ δ' ἔπε' ἐκ στόματος ῥεῖ μείλιχα, Hes.*Th.*83/4 (cf. line 97), γλυκερὴ ἐέρση is a metaphor for honey. "Honey itself was believed to be deposited in the form of dew, or to be made out of dew by the bees."[322]

Pindar's usage of the verb **ἀμφέπω** all but defies semantic analysis. Almost every single occurence of the verb in Pindar has its own category in Slater's *Lexicon.* For reasons of word-formation its denotation must be 'follow (i.e., go, be) all around.'[323]

Of fire, as in: γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε, θέρμετο δ' ὕδωρ, *Il.*18.348, *Od.*8.437. Often with negative connotations: τὴν μὲν πρυμνὴν πῦρ ἄμφεπεν, *Il.*16.124; also of men, 'being all around one' (obviously with hostile intentions): ὥς ῥα τότ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆα δαΐφρονα ποικιλομήτην | Τρῶες ἕπον πολλοί τε καὶ ἄλκιμοι, *Il.*11.482/3. In σμικρὸς ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις | ἔσσομαι, τὸν δ' ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ φρασὶν | δαίμον' ἀσκήσω κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μαχανάν, *P.*3.107-9, the point is that Pindar declares that he will always honour the δαίμων that is *present* (i.e., that is 'following around' him), that he will always adapt himself to the circumstances fate provides.[324]

The verb may have the connotation of 'following around' something, i.e., 'being busy around' something, in order to look after it, take care of it.

As in: ὣς οἵ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο, *Il.*24.804. Especially the participle is frequently used in this sense ('with good heed, carefully'), cf., e.g., ἵππους δ' Αὐτομέδων τε καὶ Ἄλκιμος ἀμφιέποντες | ζεύγνυον, *Il.*19.392/3; οἳ μὲν Φωκήων στίχας ἵστασαν ἀμφιέποντες, *Il.*2.525, etc. Thus also of a physician 'being busy taking care of' his patients, as in: λύσαις ἄλλον ἀλλοίων ἀχέων | ἔξαγεν, τοὺς μὲν μαλακαῖς ἐπαοιδαῖς ἀμφέπων, κτλ, *P.*3.50-2. 'Taking care' of a divinity is 'doing honour' to him or her, cf. φοινικόπεζαν | ἀφιέπει (Hieron) Δάματρα λευκίππου τε θυγατρὸς ἑορτὰν | καὶ Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου κράτος, *O.*6.94-6. Similarly, divinities 'look after' their sanctuaries, as in: μυχόν τ' ἀμφέπει (Apollo) | μαντήϊον, *P.*5.68/9; ἵνα καλλίσταν πόλιν | ἀμφέπει (the nymph Libya) κλεινάν τ' ἀέθλοις, *P.*9.69/70. In εἰ γάρ τις ὄζους ὀξυτόμωι πελέκει | ἐξερείψειεν μεγάλας δρυός, αἰσχύνοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος, | καὶ φθινόκαρπος ἐοῖσα διδοῖ ψᾶφον περ' αὐτᾶς, | εἴ ποτε χειμέριον πῦρ ἐξίκηται λοίσθιον, | ἢ σὺν ὀρθαῖς κιόνεσσιν δεσποσύναισιν ἐρειδομένα | μόχθον ἄλλοις ἀμφέπει δύστανον ἐν τείχεσιν, | ἑὸν ἐρημώσαισα χῶρον, *P.*4.263-9, the verb metaphorically refers to the oak 'taking care

---

322 West *ad loc.* See also Connington on Verg.*G.*4.1.

323 The idea of ἀμφέπω being etymologically derived from ἕπω (Vedic *sápati*, 'cherish, engage in') without any connection with ἕπομαι (Vedic *sácate*, 'follow') makes it difficult to account for the passages in which the verb has negative connotations (as in *Il.*16.124, 11.482/3). See Braswell on *P.*4.133 (p. 219) and *P.*4.268 (p. 369); further references are to be found there.

324 *Pace* Slater *s.v.* (p. 41, rendering 'protect').

of[325], i.e., 'supporting' the weight of a roof. In τοῦ μὲν ἀντίθεοι | ἀρίςτευον υἱέες υἱέων τ' ἀρηΐφιλοι παῖδες ἀνορέαι | χάλκεον ςτονόεντ' ἀμφέπειν ὅμαδον, *I*.8.24-5a, the verb may just means that the Aeacids 'excelled being in battle' or 'being busy in battle'; the connotation 'in order to take care of it' would give the statement a mildly ironical twist: 'they knew how to take care of noisy throngs on the battle-field.'

The verb is often said to be a poetical equivalent of ἔχω (Thummer, II, p. 134; Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 139; Gerber on *O*.1.12, p. 34). However, ἀμφέπω has a relevant surplus value over ἔχω. In cὺν δὲ τὶν (*sc.* Elithyia) | καὶ παῖc ὁ Θεαρίωνοc ἀρετᾶι κριθεὶc | εὔδοξοc ἀείδεται Cωγένηc μετὰ πενταέθλοιc. | πόλιν γὰρ φιλόμολπον οἰκεῖ δορικτύπων | Αἰακιδᾶν· μάλα δ' ἐθέλοντι cύμπειρον ἀγωνίαι θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν, *N*.7.6-10, the Aeginetans are 'willing to be busy taking care of their θυμόc,' i.e., they are willing to devote time and effort in order to increase their strength and courage. They recognize the importance of the qualities that make a man succesful (in war and) at the Games. ('Growth' of the θυμόc implies increase of physical and mental strength; see line 58 above with my note, pp. 358/9).[326] Similarly, in εὐτυχῶc | ναίειν πατρὶ Cωγένηc ἀταλὸν ἀμφέπων | θυμὸν προγόνων εὐκτήμονα ζαθέαν ἄγυιαν, *N*.7.90-2, Sogenes 'takes care' of his filial piety towards his father. Cf. also: (Hieron), θεμιcτεῖον ὃc ἀμφέπει cκᾶπτον ἐν πολυμήλωι | Cικιλίαι, *O*.1.12/3 (cf. S.*El*.651), with Gerber *ad loc.* (p. 34); νῦν δὲ παρ' Αἰγιόχωι {Διῒ} κάλλιcτον ὄλβον | ἀμφέπων ναίει (*sc.* Heracles), *I*.4.58/9. The high degree of personal commitment implied by ἀμφέπων is, of course, relevant for a king 'being busy taking care' of what his sceptre stands for; in the case of Heracles the verb may imply that he 'looks after' his ὄλβοc (cf. χρυcέων οἴκων ἄναξ, 60).

The verb may, like *h.l.*, be used in culinary contexts. In Homer it is used to refer to 'taking care' of the meat, i.e., 'dressing' it. Cf. cφῶι μὲν ἀμφὶ βοὸc ἕπετον κρέα, *Il*.11.776; τοῖcιν δ' Ἀλκίνοοc δυοκαίδεκα μῆλ' ἱέρευcεν, | ὀκτὼ δ' ἀργιόδονταc ὗαc, δύο δ' εἰλίποδαc βοῦc· | τοὺc δέρον ἀμφί θ' ἕπον τετύκοντό τε δαῖτ' ἐρατεινήν, *Od*.8.59-61; *Il*.24.622, etc.

Here the object of the verb must be μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῶι | cὺν γάλακτι from the preceding lines.[327] 'Mingled dew,' then, is said to 'follow all around' the mixture of milk and honey. It is clear from the context (especially from the qualification κιρναμένα) that this must mean that dew is added to the mixture as a third ingredient. The verb may evoke the picture of dew-drops being 'all over' the mixture (just as they are all over the fields). The dew 'dresses' the

---

[325] Thus Braswell *ad loc.* (p. 369), *pace* Slater *s.v.* (p. 41, "'cherish, enjoy', met.").

[326] I supply Αἰακίδαι, i.e. the Aeginetans living in their city and tracing back their linage to them, as the subject of ἐθέλοντι, the θυμόc being their θυμόc. They do not merely 'have' a cύμπειρον ἀγωνίαι θυμόν (Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 139; cf. Thummer, III, p. 134), but they are willing also to take care of it.

[327] LSJ *s.v.* take an implied 'bowl', containing the mixture of milk and honey, as the object to the verb, paraphrasing 'dew crowns the bowl'.

mixture of milk and honey (as in those passages where the verb refers to the dressing of meat, see above). If we extrapolate the connotations of dew having a wholesome effect on the vegetation (cf. esp. *Il.*23.597-600, *Od.*13.245/6 cited above) to the effect it has on this mixture, the positive connotations of the verb ('taking care of') may be activated; the dew adds to the quality of the cocktail and in that respect it 'takes care' of it.

79. πόμ' ἀοίδιμον

'A song-drink.' The phrase πόμ' ἀοίδιμον Αἰολίςςιν ἐν πνοαῖςιν αὐλῶν is an apposition to the complete mixture the poet is sending to the victor. See my general note on the structure above (pp. 395/6). ἀοίδιμος denotes that the notion it qualifies has something to do with song. Here it 'soothens' the metaphor, by explicitly relating the *vehicle* πόμ' to the *tenor* 'song' (see my general note on the imagery, pp. 398/9).

For **ἀοίδιμος** see my note on *P.*8.59 (pp. 548/9). The noun **πόμα** occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. In Attic authors the long form πῶμα is preferred; cf. e.g. A.*Eu.*266, *Th.*308, S.*Ph.*715, E.*Hec.*392, *Ba.*279, Pl.*R.*406a, *Lg.*844b, etc. The short form πόμα occurs also in Ionic prose (e.g., Hdt.3.23, Hp.*VM* 5) and later poetry and prose (e.g., Call.*fr.*8.20 P., Nic.*Al.*105, 299, Man.3.71, Phld.*Mus.* p. 51 K., etc.). The short form occurs as *varia lectio* for the long form in Pl.*Phd.*117b, *Phlb.*34e.

79. Αἰολίςςιν ἐν πνοαῖςιν αὐλῶν

'On the Aeolian breath of flutes.'[328] This further specifies πόμ' ἀοίδιμον, the 'song-drink' that is currently being sung. Apparently the music to which this ode had been set was Aeolian in some respect.

Cf. τὸ Καςτόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεςςι χορδαῖς θέλων | ἄθρηςον χάριν ἑπτακτύπου | φόρμιγγος ἀντόμενος, *P.*2.69-71; ἐμὲ δὲ ςτεφανῶςαι | κεῖνον ἱππίωι νόμωι | Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾶι | χρή, *O.*1.100-3; ⟨αὐλὸς⟩[329] Αἰολεὺς ἔβαινε Δωρίαν κέλευθον ὕμνων, *fr.*191 (from the scholion on *P.*2.69 [128b]). Cf. also μήτε ςύντονον δίωκε, | μήτε τὰν ἀνειμέναν {Ἰαςτὶ}[330] | μοῦςαν, ἀλλὰ τὰν μέςαν | νεῶν ἄρουραν αἰόλιζε τῶι μέλει· | ... πρέπει τοι | πᾶςιν ἀοιδολαβράκταις | Αἰολὶς ἁρμονία, Pratinas *PMG* 712a/b; ὕμνον ἀναγνέων | Αἰολίδ' ἀμ' βαρύβρομον ἁρμονίαν, Lasus *PMG* 702. Perhaps ςυρίγγων ὑπ' αἰόλας ἰαχᾶς ὕμνων, E.*Ion* 499 is a pun similar to the one in Pratinas *PMG* 712a.[331] Cf. further Heracl.Pont.*fr.*163 *ap.* Ath.624c-5e, who concluded that Aeolian was the old name for Hypodorian (see West, *Greek Music*, p. 183); Poll.4.65, Apul.*Flor.*4, Cassiod. *Var.*2.40.4.

---

[328] The Mss. read αἰολίςιν, which is unmetrical. Boeckh altered this into Αἰολῆιςιν; in *O.*1.102, however, Αἰοληΐδι, has five syllables. Turyn conjectured Αἰολίςςιν; for the ending cf. Χάριςςιν, *N.*5.54, B.15.49; θέμιςςιν, *P.*4.54.

[329] Suppl. Bergk.

[330] Del. Page.

[331] Thus Steinmayer, *Glossary*, p. 10.

Unfortunately, we know nothing about the technical details of this 'Aeolian mode.' Neither Plato nor Aristotle mentions an Aeolian ἁρμονία, and the savants quoting Pratinas and Lasus in Ath.624e ff. seem as much in the dark as we are.[332] After Pindar's time the Aeolian mode either went out of use or came to be called by another name. See further West, *Greek Music*, pp. 178, 183/4.

One could imagine that the Aeolian mode has left some traces in the metre of the odes concerned. Gerber, on *O.*1.102 (p. 155), suspects "that Pindar could have so designated virtually all the odes not composed of dactylo-epitrites." In fact, the three Pindaric odes that are by the poet characterized as being sung in the Aeolian mode (*O.*1, *P.*2, *N.*3) are metrically quite similar.

*O.*1: ‸s'ds'sdx | ⏑⏑ss'dddx | sss | sdx | sss | ss⏑⏑ssssd'ss | ssssd's | ‸s⏑⏑s⏑⏑ssss | ‸s⏑⏑'s'⏑⏑s | ‸s'ss'⏑⏑s | xs⏑⏑'ss || ‸ss⏑⏑'s'ds'ss | ‸s'd's⏑⏑ss | sssd's | ‸s's'dssdx | ‸dsd'ss | xds'ss | ‸s⏑⏑'d's | ‸s's'ds'dsx ||.

*P.*2: ⏑⏑s⏑⏑ssss⏑⏑s | ⏑⏑sd's—dsxds | xddd's | ‸dddsdds | xs⏑⏑ssd | xs⏑⏑ssdd | ⏑⏑sd'⏑⏑s's | xds'sssdsx || ‸s⏑⏑'ds'sd | ‸s'ds'sd | ‸s'ds'⏑⏑sd | ‸s'ds'⏑⏑sd'ss | ‸s⏑⏑'ds's | ‸s—s's—ds's | ‸s'd's | xsd | ‸s'sds'sdsx ||.

*N.*3: xdssd's | sss⏑⏑ss'⏑⏑s | ⏑⏑sds's⏑⏑s | ‸ss'sds's | xsss⏑⏑sd | xss—d⏑⏑x | ssds's | ‸ddssssx || dsdss—x | ‸s⏑⏑sss⏑⏑sdss's | sd'sdx | dssd'sd's⏑⏑s | ‸ddsdds's ||.
(for more details see my metrical analysis pp. 234-40).

*fr.*191: ssssssx.

What these metrical structures have in common is their highly complex repetition of heterogenic and homogenic (sometimes expanded) groups, variation of prolongation and juxtaposition and especially the great number of responding resolutions, resulting in sequences of three, four, or even five short syllables. Several verses find almost direct parallels in one of the other odes (e.g. *O.*1 str. 8 [‸s⏑⏑s⏑⏑ssss] and *P.*2 str. 1 [⏑⏑s⏑⏑ssss⏑⏑s] and *N.*3 str. 2 [sss⏑⏑ss'⏑⏑s] and ep. 2 [‸s⏑⏑sss⏑⏑sdss's]; *P.*2 str. 4 [‸dddsdds] and *N.*3 ep. 5 [‸ddsdds's], etc). On these so-called 'Aeolic' verses in general see also Sicking, *Verslehre*, pp. 150-4 (§ 6.3).

The **πνοαί** refer to the 'audible wind' that comes out of the wind instrument.

The noun πνο(ι)ά means 'blowing, blast,' so, in fact, 'moving air,' set in motion by something or someone. Cf. καί νιν οὔπω τεθναότ', ἄcθματι δὲ φρίccοντα πνοὰc[333] ἔκιχεν, *N.*10.74, the air set in motion by his last breath; δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ γλώccαι λιγυρᾶc ἀκόναc, | ἅ μ' ἐθέλοντα προcέρπει καλλιρόαιcι πνοαῖc, *O.*6.82/3, which probably refers to the (audible) air set in motion by the voice. The noun may also refers to the 'blasts' caused by the winds, cf. πνοαὶ ὑψιπετᾶν ἀνέμων, *P.*3.104; *P.*5.121, *O.*3.31,

---

[332] See also Steinmayer, *Glossary*, pp. 9/10. I. Henderson, in *Ancient and Oriental Music (New Oxford History of Music* i), ed. E. Wellesz, Oxford 1957, p. 383, suspects that the terms Dorian and Aeolian could be applied to the same music.

[333] ἀμπνοὰc, ἀναπνοὰc codd.: corr. Er. Schmid.

*fr.*94b.16. For the phrase πνοὰ αὐλῶν cf. B.*fr.Dith. vel Epinic.***23.4 (plural); Ar.*Ra.*154, 313 (both singular), etc.

For **ἐν** cf. Λυδίοις ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς, *O.*5.19; ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος ἁδυμελεῖ | θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν, *O.*7.11/2; κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς | μυρίον χρόνον, *I.*5.27/8.

The **αὐλός** is a double-reed wind instrument (similar to the oboe). The player as a rule played two of them at once, which accounts for the plural.

For a specific reference to **αὐλοί** accompanying the song that is currently being sung, cf., e.g., ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγ', ἀνὰ δ' αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν | ἱππίων ἀέθλων κορυφάν, *N.*9.8/9, where, like here, the αὐλοί are used in combination with a lyre (cf. line 12 above). The only reference to αὐλοί alone is *O.*5.19. For the αὐλός see further West, *Greek Music*, 81-107, with further references on p. 396.

• *Sound effects:* Note that line 79 consists almost exclusively of a-, o-, and i-sounds (o a oi i o ai o i i *e* o ai i av ō).

Epode Δ

80. ὀψέ περ

'Late though it be.' The phrase qualifies πέμπω (77, see my general note on the structure, pp. 395/6). Apparently there had been some delay in the delivery of the ode.

• *Why late?* The most natural way of understanding Pindar's assertion that he is late is to take it that he is literally late. One could imagine that some time, more than strictly necessary, has elapsed between the day of Aristoclidas' victory and the performance of this ode, or between the moment that Pindar was commisioned to write this ode and the aquittance of this task.[334] We cannot determine for what reason the delivery had been delayed, nor for how long, but apparently it took longer than usual, for Pindar apologizes for the delay by explicitly recognizing his shortcoming and by means of the following eagle-passage (see next note).

Ruck, *Hermes* 100, 1972, pp. 153-8, followed by Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, pp. 46 (and 60-70), and Mullen, *Choreia*, pp. 237/8 (n. 53), challanged this interpretation. "The belatedness of the poem may refer primarily to the rendering of the praise to the victor (not the

[334] Thus it is taken by the scholia (ὡς μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον τῆς νίκης γεγραμμένου τοῦ ποιήματος, 138a, III 61 Dr.; ὅλως ὀψέ {φησί} γέγραπταί μοι τὸ ποίημα, 138b, III 61 Dr.) and by most of the modern critics (e.g. Christ *ad loc.* [p. 257]: "sero quidem carmen mittitur").

poem as a whole): the praise is 'late' in that it comes only after much digression" (Hubbard, p. 46). This interpretation is impossible for two reasons. First, τόδε ... πόμ' ἀοίδιμον (76-9) refers to the current ode as a whole, not to a section in which the victor is praised as opposed to 'digressions.'[335] Second, if Ruck and Hubbard are correct, Pindar would apologize for the fact that the victor is praised only as late as in lines 83-4, while he has praised him already directly in 14-21, 67-70, and 76.

Literal delay in the delivery of the poem is paralleled by *O.*10. This poem begins as follows: τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωτέ μοι | Ἀρχεστράτου παῖδα, πόθι φρενὸς | ἐμᾶς γέγραπται· γλυκὺ γὰρ αὐτῶι μέλος ὀφείλων ἐπιλέλαθ'· ὦ Μοῖς', ἀλλὰ cὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ | Ἀλάθεια Διός, ὀρθᾶι χερὶ | ἐρύκετον ψευδέων | ἐνιπὰν ἀλιτόξενον. | ἕκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος | ἐμὸν καταίcχυνε βαθὺ χρέος. | ὅμως δὲ λῦcαι δυνατὸς ὀξεῖαν ἐπιμομφὰν τόκος †θνατῶν· νῦν ψᾶφον ἑλιccομέναν | ὀπᾶι κῦμα κατακλύccει ῥέον, | ὀπᾶι τε κοινὸν λόγον | φίλαν τείcομεν ἐς χάριν, 1-12, which is as explicit an excuse for literal delay in the delivery of the poem as one may get from a poet like Pindar. Cf. also παῖδ' ἐρατὸν ⟨δ'⟩ Ἀρχεστράτου | αἴνηcα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾶι | βωμὸν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον | κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον, 99-102, where κεῖνον seems to imply a considerable distance between the time of the victory and the performance of this ode.

Hubbard (p. 61-70)[336] does not question the fact that the 'belatedness' in the case of *O.*10 is literal, but he supposes that "the apology for lateness is itself conventional, and that *O.*10 was actually not much later than any ode for performance at the victor's home overseas. Of course, such an ode would be 'late' in comparison with an ode at the scene of the victory ..., but there is absolutely no cause to believe that by 'late' Pindar must have meant four, eight, or even more years" (p. 61). Apparently the delay was not usual, for Pindar bothers to apologize for it; and that such an apology in itself is not in the least conventional is proved by the fact that *O.*10 and *N.*3 are the only examples. See also Nassen, *TAPhA* 105, 1975, p. 223, nn. 11, 12.

There is one passage which might help us to imagine one possible reason for such a delay. In the opening lines of *I.*1, for a Theban victor, Pindar says: μᾶτερ ἐμά, τὸ τεόν, χρύcαcπι Θήβα, | πρᾶγμα καὶ ἀcχολίας ὑπέρτερον | θήcομαι. μή μοι κραναὰ νεμεcάcαι | Δᾶλος, ἐν ᾇ κέχυμαι. | τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τεκέων ἀγαθοῖς; | εἶξον, ὦ Ἀπολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων cὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος, | καὶ τὸν ἀκερcεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων | ἐν Κέωι ἀμφιρύται cὺν ποντίοις | ἀνδράcιν, καὶ τὰν ἁλιερκέα Ἰcθμοῦ | δειράδ', 1-10. At first sight, this looks very much like Pindar having accepted a

[335] Thus Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 14.
[336] Following Thummer, *Isthmische*, I, p. 87.

commision from the people of Cos to write poem (a Paean?) to Apollo. But, before he had completed it, he was commisioned to write a victory-ode for a victor from his home-town. He presents the latter as having priority, but he promises that he will try to combine both obligations in one ode.[337] It does not seem entirely impossible that Pindar was confronted with such practical problems, that he accepted new commisions while not yet having fulfilled other obligations, and that this occasionally caused some delay.

Recently Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 28-30, starting from the empirical fact that "a late drink is especially effective," interestingly suggested that "Pindar was late producing *N.*3, but ... subtly turns this to his advantage through the comparisons which first implicitly (the drink) and then explicitly (the eagle) demonstrate how some things arriving late can be very effective" (p. 29). This concurrs with my interpretation of the eagle image in *CPh* 89, 1994, 314/5, and below.

περ: The scope of the particle is ὀψέ only. Its force is concessive. 'I send you this magnificent cocktail of song, although I have to admit that I am late (in my delivery).'

The paricle περ occurs nineteen times in Pindar, nine times in combination with a relative pronoun (see my note on *P.*8.39, pp. 526/7), three (or four) times with εἰ, four (or five) times with καί.[338] These are all examples of what Denniston (p. 485) calls 'ancillary περ.' There are only two Pindaric occurrences of non-ancillary περ. In ἴυξεν δ' ἀφωνήτωι περ ἔμπας ἄχει | δύναμις Αἰήτας ἀγαςθείς, *P.*4.237/8, the scope of the particle consists merely in the adjective directly preceding it; its force is clearly concessive.[339] *H.l.* is the only occurrence in Pindar of περ in combination with an adverb. The use of περ with an adverb can be compared to a number of passages in Homer. E.g., πρόφρων νῦν Δαναοῖςι, Ποςείδαον, ἐπάμυνε | καί cφιν κῦδος ὄπαζε μίνυθά περ, ὄφρ' ἔτι εὕδει | Ζεύς, *Il.*14.357-9, where μίνυθά περ is clearly concessive ('if only for a short time', which is specified by the following clause, cf. *Il.*12.356, 23.97); ὡς αἴ γ' ἑξείης κεφαλὰς ἔχον, ἀμφὶ δὲ πάςαις | δειρῆιςιν βρόχοι ἦςαν, ὅπως οἴκτιςτα θάνοιεν. | ἤςπαιρον δὲ πόδεςςι μίνυθά περ, οὔ τι μάλα δήν, *Od.*22.471-3, 'they were kicking their feet, but (admittedly) only for a short while and not very long' (cf. also *Il.*1.416, 13.573)[340]; ἦ μὲν δὴ νῶϊ ξεινήϊα πολλὰ φαγόντε | ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων δεῦρ' ἱκόμεθ', αἴ κε ποθι Ζεὺς | ἐξοπίςω περ παύςηι ὀιζύος, *Od.*4.33-5, 'in the hope that Zeus would spare us at least in the future such pressing need.'

---

[337] Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, II (esp. p. 41), emphasises the encomiastic purpose to which these circumstances are put in the ode.

[338] Ὅςπερ: *O.*1.30, 2.38, 4.19, *P.*3.100, 8.39, 10.64, *N.*7.101, 8.18; ὅθεν περ, *N.*2.1; Εἴπερ: *P.*1.90, *N.*2.7, *fr.*6a.h, [*N.*4.36]. Καίπερ: *N.*6.6, *I.*8.5, *fr.*124c, *fr.*194.4, [*N.*4.36].

[339] Braswell *ad loc.* cites: Νέςτορα δ' οὐκ ἔλαθεν ἰαχὴ πίνοντά περ ἔμπης, *Il.*14.1.

[340] Bakker, *Linguistics and Formulas*, pp. 247/8, regards the use of περ in *Od.*22.473 as "atypical" and explains it as a "formulaic expression in its own right". To my mind, however, the difference with e.g. *Il.*14.358 is not very big.

"The concessive sense is especially common with the participle" (Denniston, p. 485). There are 193 examples of this in Homer[341], including ἦλθ' Ὀδυcεὺc καὶ οἶκον ἱκάνεται ὀψέ περ ἐλθών, *Od.*23.7 (cf. also: εἰ μέμονάc γε καὶ ὀψέ περ υἷαc Ἀχαιῶν | τειρομένουc ἐρύεcθαι ὑπὸ Τρώων ὀρυμαγδοῦ, *Il.*9.247/8). For περ with concessive force with a participle after Homer (not in Pindar) cf., e.g., Archil.*fr.*171.1 W., Thgn.267, 294, 1289, Sim.*fr.*7 W., Tyrt.*fr.*12.32 W., A.*Th.*1043, *Supp.*55, *Ag.*1571, S.*Ph.*1068, E.*Alc.*2, *Ion* 1324, *Andr.*763, Hdt.3.131, 8.11.1, Pl.*Epin.*975c, etc.

• *Literature:* On περ: Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 487-90. On περ in Homer see especially E.J. Bakker, *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer: Scalarity and the Description of the Particle 'per'*, Diss. Leiden, Amsterdam 1988. On περ in subordinate clause see also P. Monteil, *La phrase relative en grec ancien*, Paris 1963, 160-72; E.J. Bakker, '"Ocπερ en εἴπερ: een aspect van Attische conversatie', *Lampas* 19, 1986, 142-158.

80-84.

The eagle is swift among winged ones, (the eagle) who suddenly seizes, with a long sweep from afar, his bloody prey with his talons. The chattering jackdaws live low. For you (on the one hand), if the bright-throned Clio is willing, because of your victorious spirit, from Nemea and from Epidaurus and Megara the light is shining.

80. ἔcτι δ' αἰετὸc ὠκὺc ἐν ποτανοῖc

'The eagle is swift among winged ones'. For the relevance and function of the eagle passage see interpretation, pp. 221-3.

• *Coordination:* The passage in which the poet asserts that he is sending a magnificent cocktail of song to the victor and his admittance that he has been somewhat delayed in doing so is followed by a passage in which the eagle is contrasted to inferior birds; this passage indirectly apologizes for the delay (see interpretation). Neither the equation of the eagle and crows with notions in the context is explicitly made clear by linguistic means, nor the function of the eagle passage as a whole. The only signal is δ', marking the sentence as a next independent step in the argument. The interpretation of the function of this next step in the light of what has preceded is entirely left to the hearer. See introduction, pp. 26-30.

• *Word-order:* This is the first clause of a new section in the poem. Surprizingly, the copula is placed in the marked position directly before δέ, whereas we would expect the new *topic* (a reference to the eagle) to have been defined by a reference in this position. This is

---

[341] Testifying E.J. Bakker, *Linguistics and Formulas*, p. 280. Bakker gives a full list of these occurrences on pp. 278/9 (category 8 & 9). Discussion of these instances on pp. 120-37.

the more surprizing since especially with the opening of a new section in the poem the hearer is in need of an explicit *topic*-reference.

For the copula placed in the marked position directly before δέ, cf. ἦν δὲ κλέος βαθύ, *O*.7.53 (in close connection with the preceding passage); with infinitive added: ἦν δ' ἐσορᾶν καλός, *O*.8.19 (in close connection with the preceding passage, the subject being the same); εἰμὶ δ' ἄσχολος ἀναθέμεν | πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν | λύραι τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῶι, *P*.8.29-31 (effecting a break-off, see my note, pp. 509/10); ἐσσὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος, *P*.4.270 (addressing the victor after a 'parable'). The copula before μέν: "ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένες ὠκύτεραι | κέρδος αἰνῆσαι πρὸ δίκας δόλιον τραχεῖαν ἑρπόντων πρὸς ἔπιβδαν ὅμως", *P*.4.139/40 (after the address the first words of Jason's speach).

For **ποτανός** cf. *P*.5.114, *P*.8.34 (with my note, pp. 517/8), *N*.7.22, *Pae*.7b.13. This is the only substantivated occurrance in Pindar. For the of the characteristics of the eagle and the associations of words referring to flight or wings in poetic contexts, see *CPh* 89, 1994, 307/8. For **ἐν**, 'among,' i.e., 'in comparison to,' cf. lines 72-3 above.

81. ὃς ἔλαβεν αἶψα τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος δαφοινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν

The eagle, 'who suddenly seizes, searching from afar, the bloody prey with his talons,' a picture of the eagle soaring high (Arist.*HA*.619^{a}25, *A.P*.9.222.2; ὑψιπέτης, *Il*.12.201, 21.251, *Od*.20. 243, etc.), fixing his sharp eyes on his prey (Arist.*HA*.620^{a}1/2; Ael.*NA*.2.26), and suddenly swooping down upon it with unfailing precision. The adjective δαφοινός means '(very) bloody.' The qualification here is proleptic, in sofar as the prey becomes 'bloody' only after the act referred to by ἔλαβεν, which in turn is, of course, posterior to the act referred to by μεταμαιόμενος.

• *Word order:* δαφοινὸν ἄγραν is object both to ἔλαβεν and to μεταμαιόμενος.[342] The verb ἔλαβεν has been placed at the very beginning of the clause, contrary both to 'normal' word order and chronology. The effect of this is that Pindar suggets that everything happens incredibly quickly. The whole thing seems to happen at one and the same moment. Before you notice anything else the eagle has caught its prey. This effect is hightened by the proleptic use of δαφοινός. Moreover, the juxtaposition of αἶψα and τηλόθε is functional, for it is suggestive of the eagle's speed: he seizes suddenly, though coming from afar. This elaborates upon ὠκύς in the preceding line.

• *Semantics:* The verb **μεταμαίομαι** occurs only *h.l.* The *simplex* μαίομαι means 'seek after' (see my note on line 5 above, p. 250). It is

---

[342] It is for this reason that I prefer not to punctuate after αἶψα and μεταμαιόμενος, as the Snell-Maehler edition does.

clear from the context that μεταμαιόμενος here must refer to the act of 'hovering', the moment at which the raptor fixes his eyes on his prey.

The adjective **δαφοινός** occurs only here in Pindar. It is a relatively rare, mainly epic word, almost exclusively used as an epithet of savage animals. The meaning of the adjective is, however, disputed. Since it may be used as a qualification of the skins of animals (cf. esp. *Il.*10.23, *h.Pan* (19) 23/4), it has been taken as describing the colour of the skin, i.e., as 'tawny.' On the other hand, its etymology (δα- as an intensifying prefix, like ζα-; cf. LSJ *s.v.* δα-) seems to point at '(very) bloody, blood-stained,' rather than 'tawny.' The latter interpretation is to be preferred.

Only savage animals are qualified as being δαφοινός. In ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αὐτὸν | Τρῶες ἕπονθ', ὡς εἴ τε δαφοινοὶ θῶες ὄρεσφιν | ἀμφ' ἔλαφον κεραὸν βεβλημένον, ὅν τ' ἔβαλ' ἀνὴρ | ἰῷ ἀπὸ νευρῆς· τὸν μέν τ' ἤλυξε πόδεσσιν | φεύγων, ὄφρ' αἷμα λιαρὸν καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρῃ, *Il.*11.473-7, the dogs are not just 'tawny,' which would be a flat and meaningless qualification; the are 'blood-stained' as they are following the bloody trail of the deer, just as the wolfs in: οἳ δὲ λύκοι ὣς | ὠμοφάγοι, τοῖσίν τε πέρι φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή, οἵ τ' ἔλαφον κεραὸν μέγαν οὔρεσι δῃώσαντες | δάπτουσιν· πᾶσιν δὲ παρήϊα αἵματι φοινά, *Il.*16.156-9. In Διὸς δέ σοι | πτηνὸς κύων, δαφοινὸς αἰετός, λάβρως | διαρταμήσει σώματος μέγα ῥάκος, A.*Pr.*1021-3, the adjective qualifies the eagle that will get 'blood-stained' by eating Prometheus' liver. Cf. also ἔνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα· δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινὸς | σμερδαλέος, *Il.*2.308/9, 'blood-coloured,' Kirk *ad loc.* (p. 149). It can be considered to be a characteristic feature of savage animals that they eat other animals so as to be likely to get blood-stained. Therefore δαφοινός came to be a fixed epithet of savage animals also in passages where their blood-thirst is not immediately relevant. Cf. λεόντων | ὁ δαφοινὸς ἴλα, E.*Alc.*580/1 (lyr.); πῆμα δαφοινόν, *h.Ap.*304, of the dragon Python, described in the preceding lines as a ζατρεφέα μεγάλην τέρας ἄγριον that brought much evil to men and their herds; αἳ δὲ μετ' αὐτοὺς | Κῆρες κυάνεαι, λευκοὺς ἀραβεῦσαι ὀδόντας, | δεινωποὶ βλοσυροί τε δαφοινοί τ' ἄπλητοί τε | δῆριν ἔχον περὶ πιπτόντων, Hes.*Sc.*248-51, where the Κῆρες are evidently portrayed as savage animals. The epithet is transferred to the skins of savage animals that are worn as garnments: ἀμφὶ δ' ἔπειτα δαφοινὸν ἑέσσατο δέρμα λέοντος | αἴθωνος μεγάλοιο ποδηνεκές, *Il.*10.23/4; λαῖφος δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινὸν | λυγκὸς ἔχει, *h.Pan* (19) 23/4, the 'shabby garment' of a lynx. It is used metaphorically as a qualification of fire-brand in δαφοινὸν δαλόν, A.*Ch.*607/8 (lyr.). In ἰδοὺ δαφοινὸν μάσθλητα δίγονον, S.*fr.*129, the adjective qualifies the thong of a whip, which is evidently 'blood-stained' rather than 'tawny.' The metrically alternative form δαφοινεός clearly means 'bloody, blood-stained' in: εἷμα δ' ἔχ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι δαφοινεὸν αἵματι φωτῶν, *Il.*18.538, a line also occurring in Hes.*Sc.*159. The 'simplex' adjective φοινός is quite rare. It occurs once in Homer, in *Il.*16.156-9, cited above, where it clearly means 'bloody, blood-stained.' Cf. also λεῖπε δὲ

θυμὸν | φοινὸν ἀποπνείουϲ', *h.Ap.*361/2, where the θυμόϲ is 'bloody' because it has been struck by an arrow. The more common adjective with φόνοϲ, viz. φοίνιοϲ, has the same meaning, cf., e.g., φοίνιον αἷμα, *Od.*18.97; ἴϲτε μάν | Αἴαντοϲ ἀλκὰν φοίνιον, τὰν ὀψίαι | ἐν νυκτὶ ταμὼν περὶ ὧι φαϲγάνωι μομφὰν ἔχει, *I.*4.35a-6a; τίϲ, ὅντιν' ἁ θεϲπιέπεια Δελφὶϲ εἶπε πέτρα | ἄρρητ' ἀρρήτων τελέϲαντα φοινίαιϲι χερϲίν; S.*OT* 463-6; proleptic: ἡνίκ' ὀτρύνουϲά νιν | ηὔδατ' ἐπ' ἐχθροῖϲ χεῖρα φοινίαν τρέπειν, S.*Aj.*771/2, etc.

Here Pindar plays with the epic usage of the adjective, giving it an original, new application. Whereas in epic the adjective qualifies the predator, stained by the blood of its prey, Pindar transfers it to the prey itself, which is 'bloody' because of the raptor having seized him.

For **ἄγρα**, 'prey, quarry,' cf., e.g., πολλοῖϲ μὲν ἐνάλου, | ὀρείου δὲ πολλοῖϲ ἄγραϲ ἀκροθινίοιϲ | ἀγλαΐϲαϲ (*sc.* τὴν Ἀγροτέραν ἅμα θεὸν καὶ Δίκτυνναν), *fr.*(*dub.*)357; ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ νηὸϲ ἐξέφθιτο ἤϊα πάντα | καὶ δὴ ἄγρην ἐφέπεϲκον ἀλητεύοντεϲ ἀνάγκηι, | ἰχθῦϲ ὄρνιθάϲ τε, φίλαϲ ὅ τι χεῖραϲ ἵκοιτο, | γναμπτοῖϲ ἀγκίϲτροιϲιν, ἔτειρε δὲ γαϲτέρα λιμόϲ, *Od.*12.329-32; οἳ δ', ὥϲ τ' αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχεϲ ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι | ἐξ ὀρέων ἐλθόντεϲ ἐπ' ὀρνίθεϲϲι θόρωϲιν· | ταὶ μέν τ' ἐν πεδίωι νέφεα πτώϲϲουϲαι ἵενται, | οἳ δέ τε τὰϲ ὀλέκουϲιν ἐπάλμενοι, οὐδέ τιϲ ἀλκὴ | γίγνεται οὐδὲ φυγή· χαίρουϲι δέ τ' ἀνέρεϲ ἄγρηι, *Od.*22.302-6[343]; ῥηϊδίωϲ ἄγρην κυδρὴ θεὸϲ ὤπαϲε πολλήν, Hes.*Th.*442; A.Eu.148, S.*Aj.*64, 407, 880, etc. The noun does obviously not mean 'way of catching' here, as it is taken, surprisingly, by LSJ *s.v.*; I do not see how 'way of catching' could be the object of ἔλαβεν and μεταμαιόμενοϲ.[344] For **πούϲ** referring to a bird's 'talons,' cf. ὣϲ ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέπτατο δεξιὸϲ ὄρνιϲ, | κίρκοϲ, Ἀπόλλωνοϲ ταχὺϲ ἄγγελοϲ· ἐν δὲ πόδεϲϲιν | τίλλε πέλειαν ἔχων, *Od.*15.525-7. For **αἶψα**, 'quickly, suddenly,' cf., e.g., *P.*4.133 (with Braswell's interesting note on *P.*4.34, pp. 112/3), *Il.*4.70, etc., *Od.*15.193, etc., Thgn.663, 985, 1001, Mimn.*fr.*2.2 W., Sem.*fr.*7.101 W., Sol.*fr.*2.3, 13.18, 62 W., Tyrt.12.21 W., A.*Supp.*481, etc.

82. κραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται

'The chattering jackdaws live low.' δέ marks the sentence as a next independent step in the sequence. The hearer, when interpreting the function of this sentence in the light of what has preceded, easily comes to the conclusion that a contrast is involved. The contrast, however, is implicit in as much as the explicit characterizations of the eagle and of the jackdaws are not exactly contrasting. The eagle's speed is emphasized as well as its superiority, as portrayed by

---

[343] Ἄγρη does not refer abstractly to 'hunting, the chase' in both *Odyssee* passages, as it is taken by LSJ *s.v.* In 12.330 is paraphrazed by ἰχθῦϲ ὄρνιθάϲ τε. In 22.306 the ἀνέρεϲ are not as good sports as the British so as to enjoy the chase more than the quarry.

[344] In the parallel LSJ adduce (Hdt.2.70) this (metaphorical) interpretation of the noun is defensible.

the way he seizes his prey, while the jackdaws are said to range low. Both κραγέται and ταπεινά are suggestive of their general inferiority, and perhaps also the fact that they are being referred to in the plural. This gives relief to the superiority of the eagle. Moreover, the characterization of the jackdaws living low in retrospect activates the association of the eagle soaring hight up in the sky, thus, retrospectively, giving more pregnancy to τηλόθε in line 81.

• *Semantics:* The adjective **ταπεινός**, 'low,'[345] occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar, but it is frequent in later authors, especially in prose. When the adjective qualifies human beings, it may have downright negative connotations. These associations are activated here—and transferred from the habitat to the creatures—, as the jackdaws are a similee for human beings and because of the contrast with the eagle.

With the connotation 'humble, abased in power or in pride': ὡς καὶ μέγας καὶ πολλὸς ἐγένεο ἐν ὀλίγωι χρόνωι, οὕτω καὶ ταπεινὸς ὀπίσω κατὰ τάχος ἔσεαι, Hdt.7.14; σὺ δ' οὐδέπω ταπεινός, οὐδ' εἴκεις κακοῖς, | πρὸς τοῖς παροῦσι δ' ἄλλα προσλαβεῖν θέλεις, A.*Pr.*320/1; οἶδα μὲν γὰρ ὑμῖν Μυσοὺς λυπηροὺς ὄντας, οὓς νομίζω ἂν σὺν τῆι παρούσηι δυνάμει ταπεινοὺς ὑμῖν παρέχειν, X.*An.*2.5.13; cf. also Isoc.4.95, 5.64, D.4.23, etc. With the connotation 'dejected,' cf., e.g., οἱ μὲν τριάκοντα πάνυ δὴ ταπεινοὶ καὶ ἔρημοι συνεκάθηντο ἐν τῶι συνεδρίωι, X.*HG* 2.4.23; cf. also Th.2.61, etc. With the connotation 'low, mean, abject,' cf., e.g., ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές τε καὶ ἐλευθέριον καὶ τὸ ταπεινόν τε καὶ ἀνελεύθερον κτλ, X.*Mem.*3.10.5; cf. also Pl.*Lg.*791d, Isoc.2.34, etc.

κραγέται is a *hapax*. The etymological link with κράζω is evident. This verb refers to the uttering of unpleasant sounds.

It refers to the croaking of raven in S.*fr.*208, Thphr.*Sign.*53; to the sound of frogs in Ar.*Ra.*258. When referring to the speech of men it has negative connotations (cf,. e.g., S.*Aj.*1236). Cf. also ὀξυστόμους Ζηνὸς ἀκραγεῖς κύνας | γρῦπας φύλαξαι, A.*Pr.*803/4, where ἀκραγεῖς is also a *hapax* (glossed δυσχερές, σκληρόν, ὀξύχολον by Hsch.; cf. also ἄκραγγες· ἀκρόχολον, *AB* 369).

The **κολοιός**, 'jackdaw' (*corvus monedula*, according to LSJ *s.v.*), is a conventional emblem for inferiority.

Cf. ἴθυσεν δὲ διὰ προμάχων ἴρηκι ἐοικὼς | ὠκέϊ, ὅς τ' ἐφόβησε κολοιούς τε ψῆράς τε, *Il.*16.582/3 (cf. 15.237/8); τῶν δ' ὥς τε ψαρῶν νέφος ἔρχεται ἠὲ κολοιῶν, | οὖλον κεκλήγοντες, ὅτε προΐδωσιν ἰόντα | κίρκον, ὅ τε σμικρῆισι φόνον φέρει ὀρνίθεσσιν, | ὣς ἄρ' ὑπ' Αἰνείαι τε καὶ Ἕκτορι κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν | οὖλον κεκλήγοντες ἴσαν, λήθοντο δὲ χάρμης, *Il.*17.755-9. Cf. also ἔπταζον ὡς ὄρνιθες ὦκυν | αἴετον ἐξαπίνας φάνεντα, Alc.27 Bergk (= *inc. auct.*10 V.); cf. also S.*Aj.*167-71; for a poetical application of the image cf. καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες, ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδὸν | ἀντία κοκκύζοντεσέστώσια μοχθίζοντι,

[345] For the literal usage of the adjective, qualifying places as 'low-lying,' cf., e.g., Hdt.4.191, E.*Or.*1408-12; etc.

Theocr.7.47/8. For the noun cf. also Ar.*Av*.50, *V*.129, etc.

For the verb **νέμομαι** in the sense of '(administering, possessing) holding' land, i.e., 'living, dwelling' in it, cf. οἵ θ' Ὑρίην ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐλίδα πετρήεccαν, κτλ, οἵ τ' ἀμφ' Ἄρμ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Εἰλέcιον καὶ Ἐρύθρας, *Il*.2.496, 499; cf. 504, 521, 531, etc.; νεμόμεcθ' Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον, *Od*.2.167; *Od*.11.184/5, *Il*.12.313, *Il*.20.8/9, Hdt.4.19. In Pindar: ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον, *O*.9.26; *P*.4.150. In Pindar also in the active in this sense (*O*.2.12, 10.13, 13.27, etc.). Cf. also the διανέμω in *P*.4.261 (with Braswell *ad loc*., pp. 358/9) and *P*.8.62 (with my note, pp. 551/2).

83. τίν γε μέν

The victor (τίν, 83) has achieved success and fame, and the particles stress the contrast with those who have not. **μέν** is a signal indicating that something will follow, often a clause with a corresponding δέ. The normal procedure is that the *topic* referred to in the marked position before μέν is opposed to an other *topic* mentioned in the position before the corresponding δέ (the first sentences of X.*An*.1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are classic examples of this device; for Pindar cf., e.g., ἐμοὶ μέν ... τὺ δέ, *O*.1.84/5, etc.). **γε** is restrictive; it is a signal indicating that the statement made in 83/4 applies to the person referred to by τίν, and to no one else but this person. Here the *topic* opposed to τίν is not expressed, so the contrast is left implicit.[346] As the passage about the eagle contains a similar contrast, the hearer is invited to apply the image of the eagle to the victor and to identify the chattering jackdaws with those for whom the light does not shine. Moreover, the image of an eagle catching his pray is in itself suggestive of a victor in the pancration (cf. *P*.8.81/2).

There is no reason to interpret γε μέν as a representation of the so-called adversative γε μάν (as Denniston [p.387] does, on Bowra's advice). Pindar uses both γε μάν and γε μέν. γε μέν is always followed by a corresponding δέ (exept for *P*.4.50 [μέν byz.: μάν codd.]): in *O*.12.5-8 αἵ γε μὲν ... ἐλπίδεc is opposed to cύμβολον δ' ... πιcτόν; in *N*.10.33-6 ἀδεῖαί γε μὲν ... ὀμφαί is balanced by γαίαι δὲ καυθείcαι πυρὶ καρπὸc ἐλαίαc ... ἐν ἀγγέων ἕρκεcιν παμποικίλοιc (lines 25-36 can be thus paraphrased: "Theaios has won in Delphi, Corinth, Nemea, and Argos, but, Zeus, there is still one thing he wants—and his victories give him right to do so—: the Olympic Games are most highly valued. Sweet Athenian voices, in prelude [to this much wanted Olympic victory], have celebrated him and olive oil has come to Argos."; γε indicates that, although the Olympic Games are most highly valued, the voices celebrating his Athenian victory were nothing less than ἀδεῖαι). Cf. also: οἵγε μὲν ἐκ θεόφιν γενεή, θνητοῖc μέγ' ὄνειαρ· | οἱ δ' ἄλλοι

[346] Stoneman (p. 194) also bases his interpretation on these particles, but in a way I can not agree with.

μαθαῦραι ἐπιπνείουσι θάλασσαν, Hes.*Th.*871/2; ἑνδεκάτη δὲ δυωδεκάτη τ', ἄμφω γε μὲν ἐσθλαί | ... | ἡ δὲ δυωδεκάτη τῆς ἑνδεκάτης μέγ' ἀμείνων, *Op.*774-6; τοί γε μὲν αὖ ... τοὶ δ' αὖ, *Sc.*282-5; οἵ γε μὲν ... οἱ δ' ἄρ', 288-91; οἵ γε μὲν ἐτράπεον, τοὶ δ' ἤρυον, 301. In νῦν δὴ καὶ σίτου πασάμην καὶ αἴθοπα οἶνον | λαυκανίης καθέηκα· πάρος γε μὲν οὔ τι πεπάσμην." | ἦ ῥ' κτλ, *Il.*24.641-3, νῦν δέ is implied: 'but now I do,' which is omitted because it has been said already.

83. εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοίσας

The willingness of Clio is not the cause of Aristocleidas' victories,[347] but it is the condition for his victories to result in fame. δέδορκεν φάος refers to the victor's fame and glory. Clio is one of the Muses. Muses do not play any role in distributing the prizes at the Games. It is their province to celebrate the victory. They are responsible for the victor's fame to spread far and wide by means of the medium of poetry. Victories need to be celebrated by an ode like the current one in order effect glory for the victor. It is implied that the 'light is shining' for Aristoclidas because of Clio, who manifests herself in this very ode. The association of Κλειώ with κλέος is close at hand,[348] and may be Pindar's reason for chosing exactly this Muse. Clio may be the particular Muse intended in line opening lines of this ode, but, if so, the hearer realizes this only here.

The Muse Clio is being invoked in the opening lines of B.3: ἀριστο[κ]άρπου Σικελίας κρέουσαν | Δ[ά]ματρα ἰοστέφανόν τε Κούραν | ὕμνει, γλυκύδωρε Κλεοῖ, θοάς τ' Ὀ[λυμ]πιοδρόμους Ἱέρωνος ἵππ[ο]υς, 3.1-4; also in the opening lines of his twelfth epinicion (for an Aeginetan victor): ὡσεὶ κυβερνήτας σοφός, ὑμνοάνασσ' εὔθυνε Κλειοῖ | νῦν φρένας ἀμετέρας, | εἰ δή ποτε καὶ πάρος, 12.1-4. She is further mentioned in B.13.9 (context lost) and in τὰν εἰκ ἐτύμως ἄρα Κλειὼ πανθαλὴς ἐμαῖς ἐνέσταξ[εν φρασίν], | τερψιεπεῖς νιν ἀ[ο]ιδαὶ παντὶ καρύξοντι λα[ῷ]ι, 13.228-31 (also for an Aeginetan victor). Cf. also Pi.*Pae.*7a.7. It is only in later times that Clio came to be the patroness of historiography (Σ.*ad* A.R.3.1b, *AP* 9.505.12). In Κλειὼ καλλιχόρου κιθάρης μελιηδέα μολπήν (*sc.* εὗρεν), *AP* 9.504.2, she is mentioned as the inventrix of choral lyric. For **εὔθρονος** cf. *O.*2.22, *P.*9.60, *I.*2.5, *fr.*128b.2, B.16.3, *Il.*8.565, *Od.*6.48, etc.

---

[347] Thus Farnell (p. 255): "the victories of Aristokleidas are regarded as due to her dispensation or her will".

[348] See West on Hes.*Th.*77-9 (pp. 180/1); P. Friedländer, *GGA* 1931, 235; Snell, *Entdeckung*, pp. 66/7; Maehler on B.13.1-12 (II, pp. 258/9).

83. ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἕνεκεν

'Because of is prize-winning resoluteness.' The noun **λῆμα**[349] means 'will, determination, resolve, resoluteness.' Depending on the object of this 'will,' the noun may refer to a positive or negative state of mind.

Positive: φυᾶι τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει | ἐκ πατέρων παιcὶ λῆμα, *P.*8.44/5, of the 'determination' of the *Epigonoi* to sack Thebes (cf. A.*Th.*616); ἔcτα δὲ θάμβει δυcφόρωι | τερπνῶι τε μιχθείc. εἶδε γὰρ ἐκνόμιον λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν | υἱοῦ, *N.*1.55-8, of the young Heracles strangling the snakes in his craddle; ἔργα χειρῶν τε καὶ λήματοc, Hdt.5.72.4, etc. Negative: ἔcχε τοι ταύταν μεγάλαν ἀυάταν | καλλιπέπλου λῆμα Κορωνίδοc· ἐλθόντοc γὰρ εὐνάcθη ξένου | λέκτροιcιν ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίαc, *P.*3.24-6, of Coronis' desire to sleep with an Arcadian stranger instead of with Apollo; ὅcον λῆμ' ἔχων ἀφίκου, ξέν', εἰ τάδε δοκεῖc τελεῖν, S.*OC* 877; ὦ λῆμ' ἀναιδέc, S.*OC* 960, etc.

Here the noun refers to the 'resoluteness' of Aristoclidas to win victories at the Games, and is entirely positive.

For **ἀεθλοφόροc**, 'prize-winning,' cf. καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοιcᾶν δόcιν, ἀεθλοφόροιc | ἀνδράcιν πέμπων κτλ, *O.*7.7/8; (Soclides), ὃc ὑπέρτατοc | Ἁγηcιμάχοι' ὑέων γένετο. | ἐπεὶ οἱ τρεῖc ἀεθλοφόροι πρὸc ἄκρον ἀρετᾶc | ἦλθον, *N.*6.21-4. For **ἕνεκεν** meaning 'because of, thanks to' (rather than 'for the sake of,' i.e., 'in order to effect,' as the famous mnemonic aid has it: διὰ νόcον ἕνεκα ὑγιείαc, Pl.*Lys.*218e, *sc.* ὁ κάμνων τοῦ ἰατροῦ φίλοc), cf. φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖc | μυρίαιc ἔργων θραcέων ἕνεκεν, *N.*10.2/3; Πιερίδων ἀρόταιc | δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων | ἕνεκεν, *N.*6.32-4; ἴcθι νῦν, Ἀρχεcτράτου | παῖ, Ἁγηcίδαμε, πυγμαχίαc ἕνεκεν | κόcμον ἐπὶ cτεφάνωι χρυcέαc ἐλαίαc | ἀδυμελῆ κελαδήcω, *O.*11.11-4; cf. also *O.*1.99.

84. Νεμέαc Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων

The victor's earlier victories are recorded. Apart from his Nemean victory, the one that is presently being celebrated, he has also won in Epidaurus and in Megara on earlier occasions. The catalogue comes very late for an ode of this scale (but cf., e.g., *O.*13). This is another example of Pindar exerting himself to create suspense by means of a slow release of the obligate information (see my note on line 15 above, p. 271, and introduction pp. 41/2). According to the scholion on this line (Σ. 147, III 62 Dr.), the reference is to the Asclepian Games in Epidaurus, organized every four years nine days after the Isthmian Games, and to the Pythian Games in Megara, in the very beginning of spring.

The Asclepian Games in Epidaurus are also mentioned in *N.*5.52 and *I.*8.68, for a boy-pancratiast. When Ion meets Socrates he comes from Epidaurus where he has won the rhapsode-contest, one of the many mu-

---

[349] Related to the Doric verb λῶ, 'want', Ar.*Lys.*95, 981, 1162, *Ach.*766, Theoc.4.14, 5.21, etc.

sical agones taking place in Epidaurus those days (Pl.*Ion* 530a). Cf. Paus.2.26.7. See also Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, 408-10; Privitera on *I*.8.67-9 (p. 240).

For the Pythian Games in Megara, see also Σ. on *N*.5.46 [84a III 98 Dr.], *O*.7.87 [157 I 232 Dr.], *O*.13.109 [156a I 386 Dr.]; τὰ Πύθια τὰ μικρά, Philostr.*VS* 227.3 K. That the Pythian Games in Megara also had a pancration contest appears from: Πυθάεια | [τὰ ἐν ἄ]cτε[ι | π]αγκράτιον, *IG* VII 48.8-10 (Epistylium Megaricum). Cf. also ἀγωνοθέτην Πυ|θαήων, *ibid.* 106.4/5 [Basis Megaris quondam in aede Beatae Virginis]. Apart from the Pythian Games, four other names of local Megarian festivals have come down to us: the Ἀλκαθοῖα (cf. Ἀλκαθόου τ' ἀγών, *I*.8.67; Σ.*ad h.l.* [84b III 98 Dr.]; see Privitera *ad loc.*, p. 240; Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, 458), the Διόκλεια (Σ.*ad O*.7.87 [157 I 232 Dr.], *O*.13.109 [156a I 386 Dr.], Σ.*ad* Ar.*Ach*.744, Σ.*ad* Theocr.12.28; Nilsson, 459), the Διονύcια (*IG* VII 20.20, 21.35), and the Cωτήρια (*IG* VII 190.6). Victories in Megara are also mentioned in *O*.7.87, *O*.13.109, *P*.8.78, *N*.5.46, *AP* 13.19 (= Simon.147 Diehl). See further Ringwood, *Agonistic Features*, pp. 32 ff.; Kramer, *Studien zur griechischen Agonistik*, p. 45.

84. δέδορκεν φαόc

For light as a metaphor for fame and glory, see my notes on ψεφηνόc, 41 (pp. 330/1) and on line 64 (pp. 370-2). Intransitive **δέδορκα** is used in the sense of 'shining' also in: τὸ δὲ κλέοc | τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοιc | Πέλοποc, *O*.1.93-5; δέδορκεν | παιδὶ τοῦθ' Ἁγηcιδάμου φέγγοc ἐν ἁλικίαι πρώται, *N*.9.41/2.

Snell, *Discovery of the Mind*, pp. 2/3, argued that "Homer's δέρκεcθαι refers not so much to the function of the eye as to its gleam as noticed by someone else" (p. 2). For (transitive) δέρκομαι in this sense cf. e.g. πῦρ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖcι δεδορκώc, *Od*.19.446; δεινὸν δερκόμενοι, *Il*.3.342, etc.; cμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν, *Il*.22.95, etc. Cf. also δεινὰ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖc δρακεῖν, A.*Eu*.34; cιδηρόφρων γὰρ θυμὸc ἀνδρείαι φλέγων | ἔπνει λεόντων ὣc Ἄρη δεδορκότων, A.*Th*.52/3, etc. See also C. Mugler, 'La lumière et la vision dans la poésie grecque', *REG* 73, 1960, 40-72, esp. pp. 67-8.

PYTHIAN VIII

DATE

A scholion (Σ. inscr., II p. 206 Dr.) records: γέγραπται ἡ ᾠιδὴ Ἀριστομένει Αἰγινήτηι παλαιστῆι νικήσαντι τὴν λε′ Πυθιάδα. The 35th Pythian Games took place in August 446 B.C. This date has been doubted by some in the past. Herman conjectured κε′, 478 B.C., because he took lines 8-18 to refer to the Persian wars. Others inferred from ἐλευθέρωι in line 98 that the ode must have been written before the Athenian subduction of Aegina in 457 B.C.: Bergk λα′ (466), O. Müller λγ′ (458), Krüger λ′ (470) or λα′ (466), Fennell λβ′ (462). Since L. Bornemann, 'Pindar's achte pythische Ode nebst einem Anhang über die Pythiadenrechnung', *Philologus* 50, 1891, 230-247, and C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie pindarique*, Brussels 1900, the date given by the scholion is generally accepted.[1] It is certainly correct. It is confirmed by references to the contemporary political situation in Aegina, as I argued in *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-165, and as I intend to demonstrate below in more detail. Moreover, it is not incompatible with the victory of Theognetus, mentioned in line 36, which can be dated to the 76th Olympiad, 476 B.C. (see my note on line 36). Thus *P.*8 is the latest Pindaric ode which can be dated with any certainty.

---

[1] Gildersleeve, pp. 324/5; Schroeder, p. 68; Farnell, I pp. 129/30; Wilamowitz, p. 444; Snell-Maehler above the text (p. 86); Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 413; Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes*, p. 174; M.R. Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 209; Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar*, p. 201; T. Cole, *Pindar's Feasts*, p. 101; Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 211; Robbins, *Companion*, p. 265. The date has been defended most recently by Mosshammer, *GRBS* 23, 1982, 15-30.

INTERPRETATION[1]

The First Triad

The ode opens with an invocation of Hesychia. The way in which Hesychia is described in 1-4 unequivocally shows she is meant to represent a political idea.[2] She represents political tranquility within the *polis* and as such contrasts situations of internal conflict, cτάcιc, as well as situations of external conflict, πόλεμοc (3). She is φιλόφρων (1), because she makes cities prosper (μεγιcτόπολι, 2). By means of calling her Dika's daughter, Pindar makes clear that he takes tranquility in a πόλιc to depend upon the maintenance or restoration of a division of power and property agreed upon. Hesychia 'holds the highest keys of wars and counsels' (2/3), i.e., she decides whether a certain conflict will be settled in a peaceful or warlike manner. It is she that is asked to accept the honour of Aristomenes' current Pythian victory (5).

Lines 6-12 provide a bipartite description of Hesychia's powers, following the style of a cultic hymn; the two sides of her personality elaborate upon βουλᾶν and πολέμων (3) respectively. Lines 6/7 describe her soft side. Hesychia knows how to do τὸ μαλθακόν, just as she knows how to receive it, and *vice versa* (according to the principle of δραcάντα παθεῖν, the seldom questioned basic assumption in Greek thought that there is a causal relation between what one does and

---

[1] In my 'Pindar's Eighth Pythian: The Relevance of the Historical Setting', *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-165, I addressed some of the interpretative problems posed by this ode, with a slightly different emphasis. This chapter supersedes the article in as much as it covers the same ground. For well-taken criticisms of my earlier views see Robbins, *Companion*, pp. 266/7. I am greatly indebted to Professor C.M.J. Sicking, who suggested to me that a reconstruction of the historical setting would solve many of the problems concerning the interpretation of this ode.

[2] M.W. Dickie, 'Hêsychia and hybris in Pindar', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury*, ed. D.E. Gerber (Chico, 1984), pp. 83-109, takes Hesychia as 'quiet restraint in the face of the good things of life' (p. 95), i.e. 'hêsychia manifests itself in the avoidance of those excesses that destroy the pleasing effect of song' (p. 97). Similarly, Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, p. 210 n. 30, takes the invocation of Hesychia to defuse the φθόνοc that regularly attends the victor at the time of his reintegration into the polis. The main objection against these interpretations is that they ignore the fact that Hesychia in 1-4 is described in such a way as to preclude any doubt that she represents a *political* idea. Mary R. Lefkowitz, 'Pindar's Pythian 8', *CJ* 72 (1977), pp. 209-221, explicitly states text-external factors to be irrelevant. Her observation that 'the opening lines deliberately pose riddles' (p. 210), does not contribute much to our understanding of the passage.

what one suffers, and *vice versa*). This is relevant both ways, due to the double applicability of τὸ μαλθακόν. In the political context, τὸ μαλθακὸν παθεῖν is the condition for Hesychia to ἔρξαι τὸ μαλθακόν: she acts mildly when she mildly acted upon, which forms a contrast to the situation described in 8-12: if someone violates her principles by indulging in unrelenting grudge, she will show the tough side of her personality. In the context of the preceding entreaty to Hesychia to accept Aristomenes' Πυθιόνικος τιμά (5), the obvious characteristic of Hesychia, that she knows how to do τὸ μαλθακόν, is used as an argument to prove she is also fit to receive τὸ μαλθακόν, viz. this ode, which is a concrete representation of Aristomenes' Πυθιόνικον τιμάν. With remarkable economy, Pindar provides a motivation for his preceding request to Hesychia to accept Aristomenes' Πυθιόνικον τιμάν, and these lines describe, at the same time, one of the two aspects of Hesychia's personality, while mentioning the condition for her to 'act mildly,' viz. when she is mildly acted upon, which prepares for the contrasting situation mentioned in 8-12. The two contrasting ways in which Hesychia behaves, subject to the two contrasting conditions, account for καιρῶι cὺν ἀτρεκεῖ (7): Hesychia knows how to choose exactly the right behaviour in given circumstances.

Lines 8-12 describe Hesychia's tough side. If someone has driven unrelenting grudge into his heart, she will be harsh, facing the strength of her enemies, and subdue *hybris*. In lines 12-8 Porphyrion and Typhos[3] are adduced in order to illustrate that *hybris* is punished. The two transgressors of the divine order are said to be subdued by Zeus and Apollo (17-8). Apollo is then portrayed in a much more benevolent tone, as the god who rewarded Aristomenes his victory (18-20). It is a Pythian victory, so the attribution in itself is not surprising, but the close association of Aristomenes' victory with punishment of *hybris* is likely to be more than just a coincidence.

Method

The dedication of Aristomenes' victory to a deity representing political tranquility in a πόλιc is remarkable. The explicit presentation of Hesychia as representing a political idea, and especially her being

[3] At first sight one would suspect that Pindar could also have made his point without mentioning Typhos. On closer consideration, however, his being mentioned is functional in two respects. First, his death bears close resemblances with the death of Amphiaraus, which can be made productive to the interpretation (see below). Second, mentioning Typhos has the advantage of evoking Zeus (κεραυνῶι, 17), which prepares for 96 and 99.

opposed to στάσις and πόλεμος, is a strong indication that Pindar is responding to current political events in 446 B.C., and that he, in fact, has chosen to present them as interrelated with the victory at hand.

After Wilamowitz,[4] Schroeder,[5] and Farnell,[6] it is especially Burton who has exploited the historical data for the interpretation of this ode. He analyses the opening triad in detail, concluding that φιλόφρων Ἡσυχία "had for him [Pindar] a political significance and meant tranquility within a city, the opposite of στάσις" (*Pythian Odes*, p. 175), observing that "at the beginning of *P.*8 Pindar is addressing the kindly spirit of civil concord. Whether this was especially appropriate to Aegina in 446, there is no means of telling" (p. 176). This part of his discussion is concluded with the suggestion that, "if the meaning of Ἡσυχία can be extended to cover tranquility and peace in general in contrast not only to στάσις but to πόλεμος, ... this hymn, viewed against the circumstances of time when Athens had long been disturbing the tranquility of the Greek world, acquires a far deeper significance" (p. 176). The implications of Hesychia's portrayal as Dika's daughter (lines 1/2) are not analysed in depth by Burton. He explains the association of Hesychia with Dika by merely pointing out that the former operates καιρῶι σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ (line 7, pp. 178/9). Neither lines 70/1, where Dika appears once again, nor the concluding prayer (lines 98-100) play a role of any significance in Burton's interpretation (cf. pp. 186/7, 192).[7]

---

[4] Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, pp. 443/4, recognizes the relevance of the historical background to the interpretation of *P.*8. He takes both the opening hymn and the final prayer as reflecting a general feeling of hope for peace raised by the negotiations that would result in the so-called Thirty Years' Peace, without however any specific reference to the actual internal political situation in Aegina.

[5] Schroeder, *Pythien*, p. 69, connects Hesychia's evocation with *internal* political conflicts in Aegina ('demokratische Auflehnung gegen die Adelspartei'), but merely to observe that 'des Dichters hohes, zur Milde geneigtes Alter' (p. 68) summons the Aeginetans to a 'Verständigungfriede' (cf. p. 69). The concluding verses are interpreted by Schroeder as an expression of the hope for 'eine Wiederkehr wenn auch nur eines Schimmers der alten aiginetischen Herrlichkeit' (p. 76).

[6] "After her defeat and loss of maritime power, Aigina still preserved some local autonomy, and Pindar might well hope that after the battle of Koroneia, whereby Athens lost all her hold on the mainland, Aigina might regain freedom in the true sense" (Farnell, II. p. 192).

[7] The same is true for Thomas Cole, who, in his *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power* (pp. 101-111), interprets the ode against the historical background outlined below. On his interpretation of the concluding prayer as "a response to these [recent political] events and the still uncertain future they portent" (p. 101), see note 62 below. Lines 70-71 do not figure at all in his interpretation. On his interpretation of the opening triad see note 19 below. Two recent commentaries on this ode recognise the relevance of the historical setting for the interpretation of the opening triad in a way that is quite similar to Burton (Ἰακώβ, pp. 297/8; Gentili, *Pitiche*, pp.

In exploiting the historical circumstances for the interpretation of this ode, Burton refrains from going beyond the verifiable historical facts at his disposal. In itself, this is to be commended, since mere speculation does not normally contribute much to the understanding of texts. But certain questions remain unanswered. It is possible to make sense of the invocation of Hesychia, the dedication of the victory to her, and some other much disputed passages of the ode, with the help of certain hypotheses, based on the known historical facts, with respect to the probable consequences the current events had for the internal political situation on the one hand, and for the relationship between Aegina and Athens on the other. If these hypotheses are consistent with the verifiable historical data and, at the same time, help to explain passages in this ode which remain obscure without them, they surpass mere speculation by virtue of their double applicability, which may be taken as an indication of their validity.

Historical Setting

The maritime rivalry between Athens and Aegina is well known.[8] As a result of the Athenian victory over the Boeotians at Oenophyta in 457 B.C., Aegina was forced to join the Delian League on harsh conditions. The walls of the city were to be pulled down, the fleet to be surrendered, and a tribute of thirty talents, the highest sum paid by any of the allies.[9] was imposed upon the island. Athens' power had reached its zenith.

211-5, esp. p. 214). Robbins, in his recent essay on this ode for the Brill *Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (pp. 265-77), believes that Pindar quotes his own *P.*1 (following Krischer, *WS* 19, 1985, 115-124), which he takes as a signal indicating that the political situation is relevant to the interpretation of the ode (see esp. pp. 268 n. 49, 276/7). For him, the political situation "accounts for the subdued tone and dark colours of the canvas" (p. 276). Robbins' pessimistic assessment of the contemporary situation may have been confirmed by reality, but does not concur with Pindar's presentation of the situation in this ode (cf. esp. the concluding prayer; see n. 62 below) and is moreover difficult to square with the festive occasion and the encomiastic purpose of the genre.

[8] Hdt.5.82-8, 6.73, Th.4.57.4/5, Paus.1.29.7, A. Andrewes, 'Athens and Aegina, 510-480 B.C.', *ABSA* 37 (1936/7), pp. 1-7; Walker, *CAH* 4 (1926), 254ff.; H. Winterscheidt, *Aigina, eine Untersuchung über eine Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft* (Diss. Köln, 1938); N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* (Oxford, 1959), p. 192; G. Welter *Aigina* (Berlin, 1938), pp. 29-42; T.J. Figueira, *Aegina, Society and Politics* (Salem, New Hampshire, 1981), p. 167.

[9] Th.1.108.4; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), p. 98; H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit* (München, 19775), p. 211. "Archaeology confirms the first and second of these provisions, because the walls and the military harbour of the city of Aigina were rendered inoperative in

Ten years later, in 447 B.C.,[10] Athens, defeated at Coronea, was forced to abandon Boeotia and recognize its autonomy.[11] This defeat resulted in a substantial diminution of Athens' power and prestige. Anti-Athenian elements in several cities began to hope for success.[12] Oligarchic exiles from Euboea, who had joined the Boeotian forces at Coronea, returned to their island to incite its inhabitants to revolt against Athens.[13] Pericles assumed command of the punitive expedition against Euboea, but as soon as he arrived on the island, he heard the news of a revolt at Megara, where the entire Athenian garrison had been slaughtered.[14] Pericles was forced to bribe the Spartan king Plistoanax and his advisor Cleandridas to make the army of the Peloponnesian League, which had come to the assistance of Megara, turn back.[15]

There are indications that Aegina also revolted against Athens. As early as 449 B.C. the Aeginetan tribute was not fully paid to Athens, and it is not mentioned at all on the tribute list of 447 B.C.[16] It is not surprising that the diminution of Athens' prestige and power was to have its effect on the internal political relations in Aegina. It was common Athenian policy to install and maintain pro-Athenians in positions of power in cities under Athens' influence. In the case of Aegina, this would have meant that in 457 B.C. the government of the traditional aristocratic elite was replaced by pro-Athenian rulers. In their policy regarding the 'allies,' the Athenians were very much aware that the ruler is necessarily hated by the ruled, and that the permanence of their domination depended upon annihilation of the

---

what appears a single demolition project," Figueira, *BICS* 37, 1990, 76, citing: G. Welter, 'Aeginetica XIII-XXIV', *AA* 1938, 480-540; P. Knoblauch, 'Die Hafenanlagen der Stadt Ägina', *AD* 27.1, 1972, 50-85, esp. 83/4.

[10] The exact date of this battle is not known. It may have taken place in the summer of 447, or in the winter of 447/6, or even in the early spring of 446. See H.-J. Gehrke, *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (München, 1985), p. 168, n. 21.

[11] Th.1.113, cf. 3.62.5, 67.3, 4.92.6, D.S.12.6.7, Plu.*Per.*18.2/3; Bengtson p. 213, Meiggs p. 177; for the details see Gehrke pp. 168-72.

[12] Anti-Athenian revolts are known to have taken place in 447/6 in Eretria (see Gehrke p. 64) and Colophon (Gehrke p. 80).

[13] Th.1.114, Philoch. F 118 Jacoby, D.S.12.7, Plut.*Per.*23.3/4, *IG* I3 40; Gehrke pp. 39/40.

[14] Th.1.114.1; Meiggs p.177.

[15] Th.2.21, Σ. *ad* Ar.*Nub.*859, Plu.*Per.*23; Bengtson p.213/4, Meiggs p.178.

[16] B.D. Meritt, H.T. Wade-Gery, M.F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (Cambridge, 1939), I p. 218; Meiggs p. 183. In *I.G.* i2.18 a φυλακή is mentioned as well as a certain βλάβη towards the Athenians. If D.M. Lewis, *ABSA* 49 (1954), pp. 21 ff., is right in dating this inscription as early as 445, it would provide us with an additional argument for assuming that in 447/6 it actually came to hostilities between the traditional Aeginetan elite and Athens or pro-Athenians in Aegina.

old, aristocratic elites, as the anonymous author (the 'Old Oligarch') of the *Constitution of the Athenians*, ascribed to Xenophon, informs us.[17] It is perhaps significant that no ode by Pindar for an Aeginetan victor has come down to us from this period (457-447 B.C.). It is likely that in 447 B.C. the traditional elite managed to resume their economic activities and began to hope for the restoration of their political influence. Against this background we have every reason to assume that in the city, where the ode was performed in 446 B.C., there was at least a threat of discord, ϲτάϲιϲ.[18]

The First Triad (Resumed)

At first sight it seems peculiar that political tranquility in Aegina is so closely associated with the victory of Aristomenes, his victory being explicitly dedicated to Hesychia (line 5). However, the proem and the ode as a whole considerably gain in clarity, if the symbolic function the celebrations (of which the performance of the ode was a part) may have had in the eyes of the traditional elite (including Pindar's commissioner), in the situation outlined above, is fully recognised. The traditional elite had recently regained favourable perspectives, pro-Athenian rulers attempted to maintain their power, and ϲτάϲιϲ was, therefore, imminent in all probability. Aristomenes' Pythian victory does a great honour to the *polis* as a whole. Such a memorable success is likely to have had a fraternizing effect on the community that shared in the victor's glory. The entire population of Aegina with readily and unanimously takes part in festivities, meant to honour Aristomenes, a scion of a noble family and

---

[17] περὶ δὲ τῶν ϲυμμάχων, ὅτι ἐκπλέοντεϲ ϲυκοφαντοῦϲιν ὡϲ δοκοῦϲι καὶ μιϲοῦϲι τοὺϲ χρηϲτούϲ,—γιγνώϲκοντεϲ ὅτι μιϲεῖϲθαι μὲν ἀνάγκη τὸν ἄρχοντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχομένου, εἰ δὲ ἰϲχύϲουϲιν οἱ πλούϲιοι καὶ οἱ χρηϲτοὶ ἐν ταῖϲ πόλεϲιν, ὀλίγιϲτον χρόνον ἡ ἀρχὴ ἔϲται τοῦ δήμου τοῦ 'Αθήνηϲι, διὰ ταῦτα οὖν τοὺϲ μὲν χρηϲτοὺϲ ἀτιμοῦϲι καὶ χρήματα ἀφαιροῦνται καὶ ἐξελαύνονται καὶ ἀποκτείνουϲι, τοὺϲ δὲ πονηροὺϲ αὔξουϲιν, [X.] *Ath.Pol.*1.14. If indeed the author of the treatise is to be associated with the ostracism of Thucydides the son of Milesias in 443 B.C. (as Bowersock suggests in his Loeb edition, p. 465; or if the ostracized politician himself is the author, as Sicking, *Hermes* 123, 1995, 408 n. 18, suggests), which concurs with the fact that he illustrates much of what he says by events that are to be dated before 443 B.C., the Athenian domination of Aegina is included in the period he is talking about.

[18] It may have been more than just a threat and civil war may in fact have broken out between the traditional elite and pro-Athenian groups: Σ.*ad* 1a (II 206 Dr.), ἰδίαι Αἰγινήταιϲ ἦϲαν ϲτάϲειϲ περὶ τὸν τῆϲ νίκηϲ τοῦ 'Αριϲτομένουϲ καιρόν· διὸ καὶ οἰκείωϲ τὴν 'Ηϲυχίαν κατεύχεται, seems to regard civil war as a fact. Lines 3/4, however, are understood more accurately as referring to threats than to open war, as I will argue below.

a member of the traditional elite. Thus, in a situation of internal political tensions, Aristomenes' victory effects harmony; the festivities in his honour symbolize political concord in the *polis*, since a feast of this nature involves a temporary reconciliation. Moreover, the fact that everybody takes part in the celebrations meant to honour a member of the old elite recalls the former political set-up. In this way the feast for Aristomenes has a symbolic function, in that it exactly mirrors the state of affairs desired by the traditional elite.[19]

Political tranquility depends upon δίκα. Pindar implies that in 457 B.C., when the traditional elite was replaced by pro-Athenian rulers, δίκα had been violated, an interpretation of reality that must have concurred exactly with the assessment of the situation on the part of Pindar's commissioner and his fellow aristocrats. From 457 on, until the day of the festivities for Aristomenes, Hesychia, political tranquility, had been either absent or in danger. The power of the *polis* decreased (cf. line 2). Aegina was torn by a political conflict. It was in Hesychia's power to determine whether this conflict was to be settled through deliberation or by violent means (3-4). At the moment—about one year before the performance of the ode—Athens' prestige and power seemed to be crumbling as a result of its defeat at Coronea, there was a substantial risk of a decision being made in favour of cτάcιc. Pindar gives voice to the hope that the momentary political tranquility caused by the celebrations of Aristomenes' victory prefigures a permanent restoration of political tranquility. The

---

[19] Cole, *Pindar's Feasts*, pp. 102-4, explains the prominence of Hesychia in the opening triad of this ode, depending on the exact date of the performance of this ode, either as a "warning to 'be careful' in the most literal way possible—by staying put, not venturing out of home or city in any attempt to aid the foes of Athens, but rather following a policy of wait and see", or, "once peace was either fait accompli or foregone conclusion", as "an apology ... justifying the advocates of caution and defending their decision against the criticism of those who maintained that more timely support of Sparta's invasion might have either prevented the decision to withdraw or led to better terms for Aegina in the final settlement" (p. 103; cf. also Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 214). Three points are in order. First, the uncertainty that induces Cole to propose two alternative interpretations can, to my mind, be eliminated by deducing Pindar's interpretation of the political events from the concluding prayer, to the effect that Cole's second interpretation is excluded (see note 62 below). Secondly, the interpretation of the opening triad as merely a warning not to aid the foes of Athens does not explain the close association of Hesychia with the festivities held for Aristomenes and the explicit dedication of his victory to her. Thirdly, Cole does not fully recognize the effects of the diminution of Athens' prestige and power on the internal political relations on Aegina; to my mind, both the notion of Dika (both in line 2 and in lines 70-71) and Hesychia's 'aggressive component' in lines 8-11 (*v.i.*) can only be understood in the context of the old elite trying to restore their traditional power at the cost of the pro-Athenians who had held their position during the past ten years.

latter is to be achieved through the restoration of δίκα (with conservative connotations), i.e., of the social and political order of before 457 B.C. Furthermore, he seems to imply that he hopes the concord he is witnessing will influence the way in which this restoration of the elite's power will be accomplished, i.e., that δίκα will be restored through βουλαί, not by πόλεμος.

Lines 6-7 elaborate upon βουλᾶν (3) and remind the Aeginetan people of the fact that deliberation is a better way of settling a political conflict than civil war. He who acts with mildness will receive mild treatment in return, an alternative that sounds much more attractive than the one elaborated upon in 8-18(a). Thus the elaborate paradoxical portrayal of Hesychia's aggressive side has a strongly persuasive function. It is addressed in particular to those members of Pindar's audience who would be inclined to resist forcefully a definitive restoration of δίκα as the aristocracy perceives it.

Apart from these internal political consequences of the Athenian defeat at Coronea, there is an element of moral disqualification of Athens' policy. Threatening enmity between Aegina and Athens seems to be implied in πολέμων (3). ἀμείλιχος κότος (8/9) primarily refers to the attitude of the Aeginetan opponents of the old elite (cf. στάσιν ... ἐπίκοτον, *fr.* 109.3); they are warned not to resist the restoration of the traditional political system. However, it may also refer to the Athenian attitude towards Aegina.[20] Porphyrion and Typhos are adduced in illustration of the *gnome* that *hybris* will be punished. This appears very much like a threat, in the first place to Athens, but perhaps also to the pro-Athenian Aeginetans.[21] If they do not abandon *hybris*, they will be severely punished. Possibly the Athenian defeat at Coronea was regarded as such a punishment for Athenian *hybris*. Both *gnomae*, referring to the behaviour of Porphyrion and Typhos, i.e., 'Gain is most persistent when one fetches it from the house of a willing giver' (lines 13/4) and 'Force in the long run ruins even someone with great self-confidence'[22] (line 15), may be applied directly to Athenian policy.[23] The former expresses in a positive way

---

[20] Cf. e.g. τοὺς ἐχθίστους Αἰγινήτῃσι Ἀθηναίους, Hdt.6.73.5; τὴν προτέραν αἰεί ποτε ἔχθραν between Athens and Aegina, Th.4.57.5, etc.

[21] "Si tratta in definitiva di una στάσις interna al mondo degli dei," Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 566). See also Gentili, *ibid.*, p. 214: "... l'esortazione agli Egineti a mantenere la stabilità politica, e il monito, espresso attraverso i casi emblematici di Porfirione e Tifone puniti per la loro tracotanza: due esempi che potevano verisimilmente adattarsi anche alle recente sconfitta di Atene, vittima della sua arrogante politica imperialistica."

[22] For ἐν χρόνωι, 'in the long run', cf. *P.* 3.96, 4.291 (with Braswell *ad loc.*), *fr.* 33b, A.*Eu.* 1000.

[23] Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 157.

what had in a negative way been confirmed by the fate of Athens. Athenian policy could be seen as an unbridled pursuit of profit, not in the least towards Aegina which was forced to pay a higher tribute than any other ally. The profit was not 'fetched from the house of a willing giver.' Now, as was made clear by the defeat at Coronea, the Athenian empire seemed about to crumble. The accumulation of wealth turned out not to be φίλος, it finally eluded Athens' grasp. The second *gnome* may also be applied to Athens. Athens was pre-eminently μεγάλαυχος, which is not, in itself, a reprehensible quality; but its use of force made it guilty of *hybris* and this proved to be its undoing, even if this took ten years in the case of Aegina (ἐν χρόνωι, 15, is deliberately placed in a prominent position at the end of the sentence). It is significant that Apollo, who executed the punishment of Porphyrion's (and Typhos') *hybris*, is the very god who gave Aristomenes his victory, as a representative of the younger generation of the ancient elite (18-20). The close juxtaposition of the references to Apollo punishing who is guilty of *hybris* and rewarding a young scion of a noble family, not only implies the suggestion that his victory is a reward for his moral attitude, but also associates Aristomenes' victory with punishment of *hybris*, which is exactly in keeping with the poet's presentation of the victory as symbolising the restoration of the old political set-up.

The Second Triad

The second triad begins with a remarkably explicit and direct praise of Aegina and its men, both in mythical and contemporary eras. ἀνδράσιν (28) refers to the men of Aegina in the 'post-mythical' age (as opposed to ἥρωας, 27), and includes the present victor. These Aeginetans display the same qualities as their mythical ancestors, the Aeacids (mentioned again briefly at the very end of the ode, in lines 99/100). Although many Pindaric odes emphasize that qualities are innate and inherited, and although it is often implied that the abilities of the mythical ancestors live on in the victor, the explicitness of this passage is remarkable. In most odes, what is explicitly stated here, is only implied, by means of the suggestive juxtaposition of myth and victory. Moreover, the collective application of the idea in this passage is noteworthy. Unlike in most odes, the idea of qualities being inherited from the ancestors is not focused upon the person of the victor, but applied to Aeginetans in general.

Lines 21-28 imply a correlation between morally commendable conduct and glory. Aegina is closely associated with δίκα (22) and

with the ἀρεταί of the Aeacids (22/3) and the result is that the island 'has a perfect repute from the beginning (of its existence)' and that is 'sung about as having produced many successful athletes and warriors' (25-7). Thus these lines mirror 12-8, in that faithfulness to δίκα is said here to result in glory, whereas lines 12-8 illustrate that defiance of δίκα results in punishment. The association of Aegina with δίκα has a historical justification in the fact that the Aeginetan arch-father, Aeacus (conjured up by Αἰακιδᾶν), is an emblem of δικαιοcύνη (*I*.8.25/6). The close association between δίκα and the Aeacids has a distinctly aristocratic flavour. The old families traced their lineage back to Aeacus, and the connection made between δίκα and their ancestors here suggests that they have δίκα on their side. The audience are evidently supposed to notice the verbal correspondence between δικαιόπολιc and μεγιcτόπολι (2), both in exactly the same metrical position; the uniqueness of both adjectives increases the probability of the audience connecting them.[24] This echo underscores the relation between δίκα and flourishing of cities.

The break-off formula in 28-32, the familiar fiction of the poet producing his text spontaneously at the spot, involves a further, indirect compliment to Aegina, in that it suggests there is too much to say, that Aegina's successes are too plentiful to be dealt with in full detail. On the level of the real compositional concerns of the poet, the break off has the additional effect of frustrating the expectancies of those in Pindar's audience who were familiar with the genre, in that lines 21-8 seem to lead up to a narrative section about the Aeacids, as occurs in all the other epinicia for Aeginetan victors. Instead, the poet focuses on his encomiastic task in its narrowest sense (τὸ δ' ἐν ποcί μοι τράχον | ... τεὸν χρέοc ... νεώτατον καλῶν, 32/3), praising the victor, and a narrative section about the Aeacids will never follow. Then, again, the poet proceeds in a way slightly different than expected: he does not praise the victor in full detail, but rather does so *en passant*, by stating he has not refuted the reputation of his family, based on the victories won by his uncles; the emphasis is on their victories. Lines 35-7 apply the idea of qualities being innate and inherited (an idea present in 21-8) to the victor and his family.

---

[24] Cf. Burton (*Pythian Odes*, p. 180). I restate Burton's observation in terms of the probability of the audience recognizing the verbal correspondence. Pointing out verbal echoes in Pindar's odes has been a favourite game of some scholars. Some of them have failed to keep in mind that the audience, in its auditive reception, may have had less opportunity than they do to recognize such echoes. Rhythmical correspondence in addition to verbal similarity, and the degree in which the two corresponding words are special (i.e. uncommon), are two criteria that give one something to go on.

Myth

In enhancing the glory of his clan, the Meidyliads, by means of his victory, Aristomenes qualifies for Amphiaraus' words to be applied to him (38-43): 'By nature, the resolve that goes with one's γένοc is conspicuous from the fathers in the sons' (44/5).

Pythian 8 is the sole surviving Pindaric ode for an Aeginetan victor in which the main mythical narrative does not deal with the Aeacids. Here the story is from the Argive[25] cycle: lines 39-56 give quite an impressionistic account of the expeditions of the Seven and the Epigonoi against Thebes. Pindar relies heavily on the audience's familiarity with both stories, more so than in many other odes. Amphiaraus took part in the first expedition, the one of the Seven, under Adrastus' command, and this expedition was a disaster: all were killed, including Amphiaraus; only Adrastus managed to escape. Ten years later, Adrastus organized a second expedition (δευτέραν ὁδόν, 42), with the six sons (υἱούc, 40) of the deceased leaders of the first expedition, including Amphiaraus' son Alcmaeon (46), and his own son (53), Aegialeus. They were the Epigonoi (42). This second expedition was a great success (49/50). They captured Thebes and none of the leaders were cut down in battle (54), except Adrastus' son Aegialeus (θανόντοc ὀcτέα λέξαιc υἱοῦ, 53). The dramatic setting of the myth is on the battlefield before Thebes (39/40, 47), at the moment when the Epigonoi are about to capture Thebes, and Alcmaeon (46), Amphiaraus' son and one of the Epigonoi, is excelling in battle. We are presented this picture by Amphiaraus, who is staged as a speaking ghost or epiphany. He refers to the disaster of the previous expedition of the Seven (48) and predicts the outcoming of the current expedition (49-55).[26]

With 'thus spoke Amphiaraus' (55/6) the speech is closed off and a transition is made from the heroic past to the present. What follows is a much disputed passage, describing an encounter between the poet and the dead hero Alcmaeon on the road to Delphi: 'Rejoicing also myself, I throw crowns at Alcmaeon; I sprinkle him

---

[25] For a historical connection of Aegina and Argos, cf. Σ. *ad O.*8.30 (39ab, I 246/7 Dr.), Σ. *ad P.*8.20 (29ab, II 209 Dr.), Σ. *ad P.*8.79 (113c, II 217 Dr.), Strb.8.6.16, Paus.2.9.5; cf. also Hdt.5.86.4, 5.88. See further Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 172 ff.; Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 573).

[26] Lefkowitz, *First Person Fictions*, p. 81, seems to believe that the dramatic setting is the moment just before the Seven were defeated (she paraphrases: "Aristomenes' victory illustrates what Amphiaraus said, as the Seven were being defeated before Thebes, about the return of their sons, the Epigonoi"). Lines 39-42 make unequivocally clear that the setting is the second expedition; moreover, Amphiaraus refers to the first expedition as προτέραι πάθαι (48).

with song as well, because, as my neighbour and guardian of my possessions, he encountered me going to the songful navel of the earth, and he grasped hold of prophecies with his inborn arts' (56-60). Pindar connects this passage to the preceding speech of Amphiaraus by saying 'like Amphiaraus, I too praise Alcmaeon' (56/7). In fact, he gives Alcmaeon the very treatment of a victor (57). What is strange about this passage is not that it records an epiphany, an event that is much less outré to Pindar's audience than to us,[27] but that the poet says that Alcmaeon gave prophecies without bothering to tell us what these prophecies were about.

The context makes explicit that Amphiaraus' speech with its narrative setting is meant to draw a complimentary analogy between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence. Amphiaraus' words about the λῆμα of the fathers being visible in the sons, prompted by his seeing the Epigonoi displaying the same martial excellence as the Seven and especially by his recognizing his own prowess and mantic ability in his son Alcmaeon,[28] are presented explicitly as applying to the victor's continuation of the athletic successes of his family.[29] The 'coda' (56-60) again draws the parallel between Alcmaeon and Aristomenes. The poet makes explicit that, like Amphiaraus, he too praises Alcmaeon (καὶ αὐτόc, 56). Alcmaeon receives crowns and song (57), just like the victor (19/20). By referring to Alcmaeon's mantic abilities and by connecting them explicitly with 'inherited skills' (60), the 'coda' emphasises again that the power of heredity is the *tertium comparationis* between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon. The very occurrence of the

[27] See Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 183; K. Latte, 'Hesiods Dichterweihe', *Kleine Schriften*, Munich 1968, 60-75. A misunderstanding must be avoided here. Some critics, addressing the question as to why Pindar did not selected a myth about the Aeacids for this Aeginetan ode (contrary to his usual practice and to his explicit principle stated in *I*.5.19/20), suggest that he has chosen to tell about Alcmaeon *because* this hero appeared to him (thus, e.g., Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 215). This is true as far as it goes. For it can by no means be his *only* reason for telling the myth as he does, to the extent that Alcmaeon's epiphany constitutes the sole point of relevance of the myth. The question regarding Pindar's motives for selecting his narrative material for a specific occasion is answered by the relevance of this narration to the occasion. Alcmaeon's epiphany does not relieve the interpreter from his task of looking for this relevance. Thus, notwithstanding the peculiarity of the epiphany, the interpreter's task is not different than in other odes.

[28] It is Alcmaeon's martial quality that receives the chief emphasis in the immediate context. His mantic abilities are hinted at by the mention of his snake emblem on his shield (46, see my note *ad loc.*); they are explicitly referred to in line 60. See also Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 32 n. 22. For Amphiaraus' double excellence cf. also *O*.6.17.

[29] Thus also Thummer, *Isthmische*, p. 45; Hess, *RhM* 88, 1939, 287/8; Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 198; and especially Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 31/2.

epiphany underscores the parallel too: an epiphany of Amphiaraus has been related in the preceding passage; now we have an epiphany of his son.

It has been noted that lines 48-55, Amphiaraus' prophecy about the outcoming of the battle, are irrelevant to the explicitly avowed aim of the mythical example. This part of Amphiaraus' speech does not bear on the analogy between the victor and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence.[30] Of course we ought not to ascribe the discrepancy to Pindar's failure to keep control over his material.[31] As Andrew Miller has demonstrated in his excellent discussion of this passage (*CJ* 89, 1993, 31-4), the irrelevance of lines 48-55 to the avowed aim of 44-55 is yet another example of Pindar's familiar fictive mimesis of spontaneous text production.[32] We must distinguish the 'I' staged in the poems, the garrulous babbler Pindar pretends to be for the sake of creating the illusion that he composes his text on the very spot, from the poet who actually crafted highly intricate odes with great care and skill. The irrelevance exists on the level of the fictional *ex tempore* speaker, and is, as such, part of the fiction. We must not believe that the purpose Pindar is explicit about is his only purpose for telling the myth.

It is clear that two father-son pairs are contrasted in this myth: Amphiaraus and Alcmaeon nicely balance Adrastus and Aegialeus. "One father, who failed, sees his failure retrieved in the valour of his son; another father succeeds but loses his son."[33] Amphiaraus' open-

---

[30] See, e.g., Boeckh *ad loc.* (p. 311); Drachmann, *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*, p. 325; Christ *ad loc.* (p. 198); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 182.

[31] "So far as this prophecy of Amphiaraos concerns Alkmaion and his inherited courage, it is relevant to his [Pindar's] purpose; but he becomes irrelevant towards the close of it in regard to Adrastos and the death of his son. He may have found this in his epic original and was tempted to carry on the narrative too far (cf. the same fault in his story of Ixion, *P.*2.44-8)", Farnell *ad loc.* (p. 195); "Weil Amphiaraos ein Seher ist, muß er auch etwas prophezeien, also den Ausgang des Kampfes, Sieg des Adrastos und Tod seines Sohnes. Das hat inhaltlich auf die Gegenwart keinerlei Beziehung", Wilamowiz, *Pindaros*, p. 441.

[32] On this fictive mimesis see Introduction, pp. 34-7. Miller describes the pattern of ordinary speech that Pindar imitates in this passage as follows: "what happens on the level of the fictional speaker" is that "he indeed *is* 'tempted to carry on the narrative too far' (Farnell, p. 195), losing sight, in his enthusiasm for the episode, of the purpose for which he originally introduced it." The model he chooses from ordinary speech for dealing with a "momentary lapse in concentration" is "simply to disregard the fact it has occurrred and hope one's auditors will do the same." "In saying 'Like Amphiaraos, I too praise Alkmaion', the speaker either flatly ignores the last eight lines of the speech he has just reported or blithely pretends that they are no less relevant to (and laudatory of) Alkmaion than the first four" (*CJ* 89, 1993, 33/4).

[33] Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 182. Thus also 'Ιακώβ on line 51 (p. 303); Giannini on lines 51-5 (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 575); Gentili, *ibid.*, p. 212: "forse emblematico dell'alterna sorte degli uomini, di un bene e di un male," comparing *P.*3.81.

ing statement ('By nature, the determination that goes with one's γένοc is conspicuous from the fathers to the sons', 44/5) draws our attention to this and makes clear from the outset that we are not supposed to doubt the hereditary nature of excellence. The failure of the first expedition and the success of the second do not imply that the Epigonoi were in any way better than their fathers; both results had been pre-ordained by the gods, as lines 49/50 emphasise. The focus on failure as the shadow of success prefigures 81-92, where a detailed description of the misery of the losers forms a sharp contrast with the victor's success. The last triad will restate the idea of the instability of fate, as is implied here, in increasingly explicit terms.

The contrast between the two generations[34] is directly applicable to the political situation in Aegina in 446 B.C. The situation at the time of the performance, the traditional Aeginetan elite having regained favourable perspectives after ten years of Athenian domination since 457, is paralleled neatly by the success of the Epigonoi after the ill fate of the Seven. In fact, the mythological paradigm of a new generation being successful where the old generation lost, is precisely in keeping with the way in which Pindar charges the celebrations of Aristomenes' victory with symbolic significance. As I argued above, Pindar presents the festivities for this young scion of an aristocratic clan as symbolizing the restoration of the old political set-up. Thus the parallelism between the victorious Alcmaeon and the victorious Aristomenes is given a far deeper significance. Aristomenes' victory symbolically represents a victory that makes up for the losses suffered by the earlier generation in 457 B.C. This can presumably even be applied literally to the situation of Xenarces, the victor's father. It does not seem too preposterous an assumption that he, a member of the Meidyliad clan, held influential positions in Aegina before 457 B.C. A man of his stature would certainly have been included in those who suffered worst from the pro-Athenian domination. Now, the entire population of Aegina with great readiness and concord takes part in festivities, meant to honour his son. Xenarces stands by the celebrations of his son's victory and sees that things have turned out for the better, just like Amphiaraus sees his son excelling in battle and retrieving what his own generation had lost.

This gets even more significance if one considers the moral dimension of the way the first expedition came to be. When Adrastus

---

[34] On the significance of generations see B. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons*, London 1993.

organized his first expedition and asked Amphiaraus to join, the seer foresaw the debacle and refused to cooperate. Adrastus did not accept this, strife arose, and both men agreed on Eriphyle, Adrastus' sister and Amphiaraus' wife, to settle the matter. Adrastus bribed her with Harmonia's famous necklace and Amphiaraus found himself obliged to go.[35] Adrastus seemed to get away with his repulsive behaviour at first. After all, he was the only one to survive the debacle for which he was responsible, whereas Amphiaraus, the only one who wanted to act in accordance with what was preordained by the gods,[36] was killed. Thus the story of the Seven problematizes the correlation between morally commendable conduct and success. However, the balance is restored in the second generation. Adrastus is punished at long last as he loses his son, whereas Amphiaraus is rewarded in that he sees his son excelling in battle. This too is directly applicable to the relation between Aegina and Athens. From an aristocratic Aeginetan perspective, Athens had been guilty of morally highly repulsive behaviour and seemed at first to be rewarded for that. It subjected its old time rival Aegina and dominated the island for ten years. But in 446 B.C. the balance was restored (at least that was what things looked like at that moment). Finally Athens had been punished, having suffered a bad defeat at Coronea, and Aegina was rewarded for abiding to the good old principles of the Aeacids as it was now able to regain its freedom.

This leaves us with the question why Pindar tells us that Alcmaeon made a prophecy, while not bothering to tell us what it was about. The avowed aim in telling the myth, which is to illustrate the power of inherited excellence, is sufficiently served by the simple fact *that* Alcmaeon made a prophecy. However, the strategy of mentioning a prophecy while not giving its content will have the audience intrigued; they will naturally speculate about the content, and Pindar is too sophisticated a poet to cause such a reaction without intending to cause this precisely. Following the scholia (78a, 80), scholars have argued that Alcmaeon foretold Aristomenes' victory.[37]

---

[35] Adrastus' bribing of Eriphyle, to Amphiaraus' peril, was a familiar story already in Homer's days, witnessing the allusions in *Od.*15.246/7 and 11.326/7.

[36] The moral distinction between Amphiaraus and the other Argive leaders is thematized both in Aeschylus' *Septem* (568-96) and in Euripides' *Phoenissae* (1111/2).

[37] Dissen *ad loc.* (II, pp. 291/2), Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 331), Farnell *ad loc.* (II p. 196), Duchemin, *Poète et prophète*, p. 90 n. 2; Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 52; Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 211); Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 198; Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 576). Robbins, *Companion*, p. 268, takes it one step too far in saying that Pindar "allows the possibility ... that he had on his voyage to Delphi had a prediction of Aristomenes' victory, and this would suggest that he knew beforehand that Aristomenes was competing. Perhaps he had already been approached to write an

In making a guess about the content of the prediction, they do exactly what Pindar intended his audience to do; and this specific guess leaps to mind quite easily. However, if this indeed were the content of the prophecy, it still remains to be explained why Pindar does not simply say so. By not specifying the content of the prophecy Pindar leaves it open to his audience to believe that it may have foretold something else as well. In the light of the historical setting of the performance, the Aeginetan aristocracy having just regained favourable perspectives after ten years of pro-Athenian domination, the audience may very well have been tempted to conclude that Alcmaeon's prophecy foretold a definite punishment of Athens and of pro-Athenian elements in Aegina, and a restoration of the old political set-up.[38] These issues will certainly have bothered the audience; probably cτάcιc was imminent; Pindar addresses these issues in this ode. To say 'I praise Alcmaeon for he has foretold something' in such a context is an effective means of suggesting that the divine world has pre-ordained a political change for the better. A tacit allusion to such a prophecy would also have had a persuasive effect, in that it invests those present in the audience who would oppose a reversal of the political set-up with gnawing anxieties that their opposition could very well be useless since the reversal was destined to take place.

Finally, it must be observed that the myth and its 'coda' present two contrasting sides of Alcmaeon. Amphiaraus' speech portrays him as a fierce warrior (46-7), the coda shows him from a gentle side. Lefkowitz (*CJ* 72, 1977, 213) is right in pointing out that the connotations of γείτων (58) help to emphasise the friendly nature of his encounter with Pindar.[39] Alcmaeon's double-sidedness parallels the two sides of Hesychia's personality. In fact, the verbal echo ὑπάντακεν (59) ~ ὑπαντιάξαιcα (11)—the former referring to Alcmaeon's gentle approach, the latter to Hesychia's fierce opposition—intends to draw attention to the parallel.[40] The same double-sidedness is present in the poet's portrayal of Apollo, who punishes Porphyrion (18) and receives the victor 'with benevolent mind' (εὐμενεῖ νόωι, 18). With each of these three contrasts it is made clear that it is the situation that dictates whether to act mildly or with

---

ode if Aristomenes should win" (see also pp. 270/1 with n. 61). There is no need to find a rational source for the information which Pindar (implicitly) attributes to Alcmaeon.

[38] Thus Krischer, *WS* 19, 1985, 123; Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 198 with n. 21, 203; Robbins, *Companion*, p. 271.

[39] Cf. esp. *N.*7.86-9.

[40] Thus also Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 213.

force. In the words of the proem, in different situations different actions are expedient, cὺν καιρῶι (7). Against the background of the political situation in Aegina, the recurrent emphasis on contrasting ways of behaving oneself in contrasting situations is a recurrent reminder to the pro-Athenians in Pindar's audience that the restoration of the old political set-up can be accomplished smoothly, if they are willing to step down, but that, if they resist, a different situation will exist, in which force will be the fitting way for the aristocracy to restore their power.

The Fourth Triad

The reference to Delphi in line 59 smoothly leads us into a prayer to Apollo, in his capacity of the god of the venue where Aristomenes has won the victory that is currently being celebrated,[41] as well as of the Aeginetan Delphinian Games at which he has won on an earlier occasion (61-6). Emphasis on the popularity of Apollo's sanctuary in Delphi (πάνδοκον | ναὸν εὐκλέα, 61/2) has the double function of adding to the god's glory and importance and adding to the victor's glory.[42]

The climax of the prayer, the actual request (67-69), is "one of the most controverted passages in Pindar":[43] 'Lord, with willing mind do I pray: look according to some harmony at every place where I come. At the side of the sweet-singing procession Right is standing: I pray, Xenarces, for the gods' imperishing regards on your fortunes.' That Pindar would pray for Apollo to take care of musical 'harmony' makes sense. Music is an integrated part of the performance of a victory ode. Divine assistance in this field would certainly be welcome. Apollo, the god of music and the lyre, is the right deity to invoke for such a request. The indefinite τιν', however, seems to support the idea that, in addition, ἁρμονία is used metaphorically.[44] It has been argued that the metaphorical interpretation suggested is propriety in encomiastic duties, in particular 'thematic harmony,'

[41] As often, there is an interaction between 'roads' and 'journeys' the poet refers to in his text and the thematic direction of his text. On the level of the poet's thematic procedures, too, we meet Alcmaeon (56-60) on our own road from Thebes (the scene of lines 39-56) to Delphi (61-65).

[42] Emphasising the importance of the festival at which the victor has won is a common encomiastic procedure. Cf. e.g. the opening lines of *O.*1.

[43] Farnell, II, p. 196.

[44] Thus Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 289.

i.e., propriety in thematic transitions.[45] However, appropriate composition is not at issue in this passage. The fact that Dika immediately follows gives rise to a different interpretation. Dika occurred in the first line of this ode, in an explicitly political context.[46] This makes it likely that 'certain harmony' refers to political concord on Aegina. The idea of ὁμολογία ἐκ διαφερομένων underlying ἁρμονία (cf. Pl.*Smp.*187a-c) applies well to the unifying effect that the victory celebrations have on a community divided by political tensions. The poet's prayer for ἁρμονία thus reflects the hopes for a peaceful solution of the internal political tensions as expressed in the opening triad, i.e., for continuation of the situation he witnesses during the victory celebrations. The poet's explicit 'willingness' (ἑκόντι δ' εὔχομαι νόωι, 67) then is more than just a conventional element of epinician diction: it implies a declaration of solidarity with the Aeginetan aristocracy.[47] By using a musical *terminus technicus* to refer to political concord, Pindar underscores this connection between the festivities for Aristomenes, of which his ode was a part, and internal Aeginetan solidarity. The newfangledness of the usage of ἁρμονία here is the result of Pindar's attempt to intertwine song and political concord and to show the momentary connection between the two by using one and the same word to refer to both.

Dika's presence at Aristomenes' victory-procession in lines 70-1, κώμωι μὲν ἁδυμελεῖ | Δίκα παρέσταϰε, is generally taken to refer to the 'encomiastic propriety' heeded by the poet, in the sense of 'appropriate composition,'[48] or to imply the idea that the victor fully deserves the praise he is getting.[49] But there is no passage in Pindar where δίκα refers to 'encomiastic propriety,' the opposite of encomiastic excess. Moreover, 'appropriate composition' is not the issue in this passage. Note also that Pindar does not say that Dika is present in his song, but

---

[45] Thus Σ. 95a, Fennel *ad loc.* (p. 242), Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 331), Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 74), Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, p. 288; Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 186; Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286-92.; Carne-Ross, *Pindar*, p. 180; Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 230/1. Alternatively, Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 475/6, argues in favour of interpreting ἁρμονία as 'fittingness', moderation, i.e., as implying the warning that Aristomenes must not let the success go to his head.

[46] For the different, non-political, interpretations of Δίκα suggested see my note on 70/1 below.

[47] A similar statement occurs in *N.*5.46/6 (χαίρω δ' ὅτι | ἐϲλοῖϲι μάρναται πέρι πᾶϲα πόλιϲ), where the poet explicitly declares his solidarity with Aegina in concord defending her cause in an all-out war against Athens.

[48] Thus Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, II p. 61 n. 69; Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286-292.

[49] Thus Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367/8. Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 580) takes Dika to refer to praise that is 'just' in the sense that it neither exaggerates nor understates the victor's accomplishment.

that she is standing by the κῶμος, a statement that focuses less on the poet's own specific role than on the collective Aeginetan celebration of this victory.[50] That Aristomenes fully deserves this collective Aeginetan celebration is certainly an implication of these lines. But the fact that Dika occurrs in the first line of this ode, in an explicitly political context, suggests that there is more to it. As I have argued above, the feast for Aristomenes has a symbolic function, in visualizing political concord in the *polis*, and, as everyone takes part in the celebrations meant to honour a member of the traditional elite, recalls the old political set-up. The celebrations thus symbolize the state of affairs desired by the traditional elite. As δίκα, in the eyes of the elite, represents this desired state of affairs, i.e., the division of power and property that prevailed before 457 B.C., it is highly appropriate to say that 'at the side of the sweet-singing procession Dika is standing by'. Thus interpreted, the statement means that 'at this moment, during the feast for Aristomenes, there is a situation of δίκα in Aegina, a situation in which, momentarily, rivalling factions are reconciled and in which, momentarily, the old balance of power is restored: all Aeginetans collectively celebrate a scion of a noble family'. The festivities symbolize δίκα as it is perceived by the traditional elite.

The statement that the current festivities visualize a momentary restoration of δίκα as the elite perceives it, is followed by a prayer that this restoration of δίκα will turn out to be definitive: 'I pray, Xenarces, for the gods' imperishing regards on your fortunes' (70/1).

73-78. *Motivation of the Prayer to Apollo*

The drift of this passage (73-8) is: 'If someone has acquired good things without long-lasting pain or trouble, he seems to the many a clever man. But this is not cleverness, for it is not in a man's power to decide himself whether he will acquire goods and whether acquiring them will cause him trouble. This the deity provides, tossing on high now one, now another; casting another man below his hands, he enters the arena with measure.' The point is not that "victory cannot be gained without cost (only fools think otherwise),"[51] but that successes achieved without trouble are not a manifestation of cleverness (as many think) but of divine favour.

---

[50] The κῶμος metaphorically referring to the choral performance of the present ode. See my note *ad loc.* (pp. 561-6).

[51] Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 215. Thus also Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 187.

The problem is γάρ (73). The particle signals that this passage motivates the preceding prayer.[52] But how do the gnomic reflections motivate the poet's prayer for Apollo to take care of 'harmony' and for the gods to bestow an eternal favour upon the victor's family? The suggestion of γάρ is that ἐcλὰ πέπαται μὴ cὺν μακρῶι πόνωι elaborates upon ὑμετέραιc τύχαιc. It has been argued that the passage derives its relevance from the circumstance that Aristomenes had won his victory easily: "Aristomene era un ragazzo (e al limite di questa categoria [come si può arguire dal fatto che non è menzionato il suo allenatore]), che aveva ottenuto vittorie 'senza molta fatica'," Giannini (*QUCC* 49, 1995, 53 with n. 65).[53] This is implausible. ἔργωι in 80 stresses the effort that Aristomenes made in achieving three victories at the Aeginetan Heraea. Moreover, in Pindar's frame of reference πόνοc is a necessary (although not sufficient) condition of athletic achievement.[54] Miller states: "We must take it as axiomatic that lines 73ff. are applicable to the case at hand only *per contrarium*" (*GRBS* 30, 1989, 467). This is also unsatisfactory. The assumption that this passage means to impart that Aristomenes did in fact invest much trouble in achieving his successes, fails to explain why it is necessary to take a stand against the view that successes won without trouble are a result of cleverness. The application *per contrarium* would make sense only as a response to the idea that the victor was stupid to make so much effort; the assessment that it is divine interference that decides whether effort will be needed in order to gain success, would convey the absurd suggestion that Aristomenes' πόνοc is due to lack of divine favour.

The τύχαι of Xenarces and his family consist in Aristomenes' recent victory, naturally; but the context focuses upon the symbolic significance of the victory celebrations: as lines 70/1 make clear, their τύχαι consist in the temporary restoration of the situation of δίκα in Aegina, visualized by the celebrations honouring Aristomenes. This momentary restoration of δίκα as aristocracy perceives it, has in fact come about 'without long-lasting trouble': That the Aeginetan aristocracy had recently regained favourable perspectives was due to the Athenian defeat at Coronea; not much Aeginetan blood had been spilled over that reversal of fortune. The restoration of δίκα (if only for one day) had come peacefully, out of the collective Aeginetan willingness to take part in the festivities for an impor-

---

[52] Thus Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 466 with nn. 11, 12.

[53] Repeated in his note *ad loc.* in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 580/1. Thus also Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 73). Cf. Méautis, *Pindare le Dorien*, p. 363; Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 212).

[54] Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 467.

tant victory, so 'without long-lasting trouble,' as opposed to a restoration of aristocratic supremacy by force. Lines 73-8 emphasize that such a good fortune must be ascribed to divine pre-ordinance: Aristomenes' Pythian victory was a favour granted by Apollo; its result, the temporary restoration of the old balance of power, too, is Apollo's gift, which conveys the suggestion that the aristocracy have the gods on their side.

The divine favour asked for in the preceding lines consists in the continuation of this situation of δίκα as aristocracy perceives it: the prayer is for definitive restoration of the traditional set-up. The wish for ἁρμονία, metaphorically interpreted as 'concord' (and for Hesychia in the opening triad) gives voice to the hope that the definitive restoration of aristocratic power will be brought about peacefully. ἐcλά has aristocratic connotations, denoting what befits a noble (see my note on *N.*3.29, pp. 630-8); ἐcλὰ πέπαται is a suitable phrase to refer to a change in the political set-up that restores to the aristocracy the opportunity of acting according to its status. μὴ cὺν μακρῶι πόνωι is parallel to κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν and Hesychia, and contrasts a long-lasting, painstaking restoration of aristocratic supremacy by force in an atmosphere of cτάcιc. Thus, the preceding prayer does in fact implore the gods to grant ἐcλὰ μὴ cὺν μακρῶι πόνωι. This passage then forms a precise motivation of the preceding prayer. It explains that it is beyond human capacities to effect ἐcλά without long-lasting trouble and that, therefore, divine assistance is necessary.

The wish for a peaceful change of political set-up is not some pious desire of an old poet in a pacifistic mood: it has an overtly persuasive force. It is a straightforward imperative to pro-Athenian elements in his audience not to resist, as the bipartite description of Hesychia's powers in the opening triad emphasizes. From the perspective of Pindar's commissioner and his fellow-aristocrats, a peaceful solution means unconditional surrender of the pro-Athenians. This passage responds to or anticipates an attitude on the part of pro-Athenian elements in Pindar's audience of the type: 'okay, things may have changed for the worse, but we won't give up our rights just like that; we will sell our lifes dearly, let them fight for it.' By dissociating a 'peaceful solution' from clever dexterity and ascribing it to divine pre-ordinance, Pindar suggests that any resistance is useless. Tricky cleverness is something one may oppose; divine interference is not. The explicit reference to the termination of divine favour in 77/8, drives the point home. 'This the deity provides, tossing on high now one, now another; by casting another below his hands, he enters the arena in keeping with the idea of full measure',

i.e., by disfavouring someone, he demonstrates that there is a limit to his favours. The exact force resides in the δαίμων's drawing the line for some, after he has favoured them for a while. The pro-Athenians are meant to be concerned.

The Final Triad

The wrestling imagery in 77/8 helps to smoothen the transition to the remainder of the catalogue of Aristomenes' earlier victories, won at the Pythian Games of Megara, the Marathonian Heraclea, and the Aeginetan Heraea (78-80). Then, with the beginning of the fifth triad, the attention shifts to his present victory: 'You fell from high above on four bodies, meaning them harm.' The explicit reference to four opponents is equivalent to proud claims, found elsewhere, of victors having won the tournament without once having been ἔφεδρος. This makes lines 81/2 understandable as a reference to an honourable particularity of the victory at hand. This complimentary actuality is exploited as an occasion to visualize the victor's superiority (ἔμπετες ὑψόθεν, 81) and his fierce, aggressive attitude, as it is emphasized by the martial terminology (esp. κακὰ φρονέων, 82).

Then follows one of the most memorable passages in Pindar, describing the misery of the beaten opponents with graphic directness: 'For them the result in the Pythian festival was not a sweet homecoming like yours; nor, when they returned to their mothers, did sweet laughter rouse joy all around. Down narrow alleys, out of their enemies way, they shrink back, bitten by their misfortune.' The defeated contestants hide away from people, trying to become invisible, in order not to grant their enemies the pleasure of ridiculing their dishonour. The λαῦραι, 'back-streets,' which one takes in order to avoid meeting people (cf. ἐπίκροφον οἶμον, *O*.8.69),[55] as opposed to the broad avenues the triumphant victor would walk through, like the εὐρυχόρους ἀγυιάς (55) by which the victorious army of the Epigonoi went through Argos.[56] These evocative lines obviously provide an effective contrast to the victor's happiness. The description of the misery of the defeated contestants ties in closely with the

---

[55] Cf. also Apul.*Met*.3.10 (cit. Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 215 n. 19).

[56] Robbins, *Companion*, p. 274, sees a further parallel between the defeated contestants and the myth in the reference to the 'mother' in line 85: "it is impossible not to remember here that Alcmeon too had a return not without shadow, for he either returned to murder his own mother Eriphyle or, if he murdered her before his departure with the Epigonoi, had no mother to return to." Robbins' n. 74 gives references for the two alternative versions.

theme of the final triad as a whole: it compellingly presents misfortune as the shadow of success, thus preparing for the passage about the instability of fate that is to follow.

The evocative description of the misery of Aristomenes' defeated opponents helps to underscore his fierce aggression. The emphasis upon Aristomenes' harsh side has the function of attributing to him the same kind of two-sidedness that characterizes Hesychia (6/7, 8-12), Apollo (17-20, 61-6), Alcmaeon (45-7, 56-60), and the δαίμων (77/8). Aristomenes' gentle side is not explicitly described in the ode, but the festivities themselves, of which the performance of this ode was a part, serve as a fitting contrast to his tough demeanour during the competition. This is especially true in the light of the fraternizing effect (if only for one day) that the festivities might have had on the society torn by conflict. The association of such double-sidedness with the idea of καιρός, explicit in the case of Hesychia (7), applies to the victor too: in order to achieve κλέος he has to display his fierce qualities in the fight; during the festivities, it is expedient to the same purpose for him to show his gentle side.

Then a generic passage follows, with obvious relevance to the victor: 'He whom in times of great prosperity is granted a new delight flies from hope on the wings of his manliness, having a stronger ambition than riches' (88-92). Great prosperity gives someone the opportunity to try and achieve great things and is therefore a ground for high hopes. If he succeeds, achieving a new καλόν (e.g., a victory in one of the Great Games) in addition to the prosperity he has already achieved, he leaves behind the stage of hoping, since his hopes have been realized. Then he flies from mouth to mouth on the wings of his capacities, i.e., his capacities have earned him κλέος, because his ambitions surpass mere accumulation of riches. In other words, if one possesses wealth in combination with ἀνορέαι, one can either exert oneself to enlarge one's riches or strive at a higher goal, such as a victory in the Great Games. Only the latter option will earn one κλέος. Aristomenes is the obvious example of someone who has chosen the right option and has indeed earned κλέος.

Lines 88-91 (καλόν τι νέον, πέταται) echo 33/4 (νεώτατον καλῶν, ποτανόν). In 33/4 the poet exhorts himself that the victor's νεώτατον καλῶν must go (ἴτω) 'winged' (ποτανόν) by his skills. Now, near the end of the ode, the victor actually is 'flying.' This sophisticated technique of ring-composition has a close parallel in *N.*3, where in 6/7 victory 'thirsts for' song; in 76-9, near the end of the ode, a song-drink is indeed presented to the victor. The qualifications of the two words denoting flight, ἐμᾶι ... ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶι (34) and ὑποπτέροις ἀνορέαις (91) mirror eachother. Pindar elegantly connects the need

for 'flying' with his own skills and the fulfilment of this need with the victor's own capacities.

The emphasis upon wealth as an instrument for acquiring immaterial rewards touches upon the core of aristocratic ideology. Pindar speaks for his aristocratic commissioners and defends their way of life that had become increasingly challenged by the rise of the money (i.e., disembedded) economy. The passages in which he does so are directed against those elements in his audience, in his commissioner's society, who oppose the old aristocratic ideals.[57] In Aegina in 446 B.C., these would certainly include the pro-Athenians who had been in power for the last ten years.

'In a short time the pleasure of men is growing. Just so it also falls on the ground, ruined by a repellent attitude. Creatures of one day. What is someone? What is someone not? Of shadow a dream is man' (92-6). This is a comment not upon the null and void insignificance of men, but upon their elusiveness because of the impermanence of their daily condition, due to their total subjection to the caprices of fortune.[58] A man's fortune changes so quickly (ἐν ὀλίγωι, 92), that he changes with each day. 'But whenever god-given gleam comes, shining light attends men and a sweet life.' The emphasis is on διόcδοτοc. The divine origin of the αἴγλα ensures its higher degree of permanence. The formulations are generic, but Aristomenes is the obvious example of someone whom was given 'god-given brilliance,' viz. a victory in one of the Great Games.

Gnomic sequences like this one, rubbing in the instability of fate, are generally taken to imply a "warning to the victor not to let success go to his head."[59] Such passages are thought to serve as a re-

---

[57] Leslie Kurke's excellent discussion of the nexus of ideas underlying these passages is blurred by her concept of Pindar's audience as a continuum consenting with the aristocratic ideals of his commissioner. For her, the rhetorical function of these passages is to "convince a sometimes recalcitrant aristocracy to continue its visible expenditure within the civic sphere" (*Traffic in Praise*, p. 228). The notion of Pindar lecturing his commissioners on his own account is difficult to reconcile with the encomiastic purposes of the genre.

[58] Bieler, *WS* 51, 1933, 143-5, regards cκιᾶc as a subjective genitive: 'a dream dreamt by a shadow, i.e., by a dead man.' Jüthner, *WS* 54, 1936, 142/3, rightly insists that this does not make sense in the context. Toohey, *QUCC* 26, 1987, attempts to reanimate Bieler's interpretation by taking 'shade, phantom' to be a metaphor for a man living without *charis*, i.e., not praised (p. 82). It is very difficult to give ὄναρ a place in this interpretation, as Toohey himself admits (p. 79 n. 26). The context is generic; it does not distinguish between men with and without fame and glory. Moreover, the idea of death is absent in the context, which makes the metaphorical interpretation of cκιά as 'dead man' unlikely; it is even less likely to go one step further and take 'dead man' in turn to be an image for 'man lacking *charis*.'

[59] Carne-Ross, *Pindar*, p. 48.

minder of the precious nature of good fortune embodied in the victory. "Its functions are not significantly different from those of the comparable self-contained formula that we use in recognition of prosperity, 'touching' or 'knocking on wood'" (Young, *Isthmian 7*, pp. 27/8). The poet's supposed didactic prerogative, warning the victor in his moment of glory on his own account, is not to be over-emphasized. More often than not, such 'warnings' have a more specific relevance; as one would expect, such passages frequently serve the encomiastic purpose of the ode at hand in quite a direct way. Here, the annihilation of τὸ τερπνόν is presented as caused by a wrong moral disposition (ἀποτρόπωι γνώμαι, 94), just as ἔχων | κρέccονα πλούτου μέριμναν (91/2) defines the mental attitude required for success. Thus lines 91-4 resume the theme of the correlation between morally commendable conduct and glory—as stressed in the opening triad and lines 21-8, and problematized by the myth—in explicit terms. When applied to the victor, the implication is that his victory, and the fame and glory that are its results, are to be seen as a reward for a commendable moral disposition on his part. The preceding passage about the right way of dealing with wealth (88-92) defines his commendable moral disposition in terms of adherence to aristocratic principles. This strongly suggests that this passage has relevance to the political situation in Aegina. When viewed against the background of the political tensions in Aegina, the final triad is charged with significance. Aristomenes' victory, symbolizing the restoration of δίκα as aristocracy perceives it, is presented as a reward for his and his family's sticking to moral principles that are the very core of the aristocratic way of life. As a contrast, the reversal of good fortune is, in general terms, ascribed to a repellent moral attitude (94). There is a clear contrast between the passage describing the good, aristocratic way of handling riches, as an instrument to acquire κλέοc (88-92), and the condemnation of unbridled pursuit of κέρδοc by force in 13-5, a gnomic passage that is directly applicable to Athens' attitude towards Aegina and probably also to the attitude of the pro-Athenian elements in Aegina towards the old elite. Thus Pindar presents the recent reversal of the political perspectives of the two opposing groups in the Aeginetan society in terms of a reward for the morally correct attitude and punishment of the wrong moral disposition; and, by describing the commendable morale in terms of living up to standards that are the prerogative of the old establishment, stigmatizing their opponents as merely having been led by the pursuit of wealth for its own sake, the poet compellingly provides a framework in which the momentary restoration of the old political set-up is inevitable and in fact according to δίκα: the way it should

be. The association of the reversal of fortune with divine power (especially διόcδοτοc, 96), illustrated by Aristomenes' victory (as granted by Apollo, cf. 19-21, 64/5), conveys the suggestion that the old elite has the gods on its side, a suggestion that is meant to have a persuasive effect upon the pro-Athenian elements in Pindar's audience by implying that any resistance to the restoration of the old political set-up is useless, a point that has been made also in the motivation of the prayer to Apollo (73-8).

The ode is concluded with a prayer: 'Aegina, our mother, keep this city in her voyage of freedom, with Zeus and lord Aeacus, Peleus and the noble Telamon, and with Achilles.' The use of ἐλευθέρῳ (98) implies that Pindar is referring to the political relations between Athens and Aegina. The choice of the *present* imperative (κόμιζε, 99) is motivated by the fact that the action the addressee is urged to take is already being performed at the moment of exhortation:[60] 'Keep this city in her voyage of freedom.'[61] The nautical metaphor is suitably applied to a nation whose prosperity and power had always depended primarily on their maritime superiority. Apparently Pindar takes the view that the *polis* is already 'on a voyage of freedom' at the moment the ode is sung. In his view, it has liberated itself from the yoke of foreign domination since the Athenian defeat at Coronea. Pindar explicitly expresses the wish that this will remain so in the future.[62]

---

[60] See Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 14-43 and 154-170, esp. pp. 157, 160/1. See further my note *ad loc.* (pp. 600/1).

[61] Translation by C.M. Bowra, *The Odes of Pindar* (Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 237.

[62] Thomas Cole, *Pindars Feasts*, 100/1, emphasizes that *P.*8 has taken shape in a period of great uncertainty regarding the consequences of Athens' defeat at Coronea and consequently interprets the concluding prayer as "a response to these [recent political] events and the still uncertain future they portend" (p. 101). To my mind, the concluding prayer is the clearest indication in this ode that Pindar considered the events as already having resulted in a situation that was favourable for the Aeginetan elite. Emmet Robbins, in the essay on this ode for the *Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (ed. Gerber), Leiden 1997, pp. 265-77, responding to my article in *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-165, attributes to me "the unusual view" that the concluding prayer implies that Aegina "has already liberated itself from the yoke of foreign domination," reminding me of the fact that "Aegina was *not* free in 446" (p. 266). I hope to have made it more clear here than in my earlier article that, in my view, the concluding prayer reflects Pindar's assessment of the current state of affairs in Aegina, motivated by the recent defeats suffered by the Athenian Empire. That Aegina was 'on a voyage of freedom' is Pindar's interpretation of the situation in 446, not mine. In fact, with the advantage of hindsight we can see that Pindar's contemporaneous assessment of the political developments was wrong, for the Thirty Years Peace (446/5) was to lead to the definitive recognition of Athens' domination of Aegina. But this does not mean that Pindar, lacking the advantage of hindsight, cannot give voice to an optimistic interpretation of the developments in 446. For a prayer to a deity to grant the continuation of an existing situation, cf. *O.*12.1/2.

Summary & Conclusion

The unity of *Pythian* VIII consists in the intertwining of three themes. The first theme, which occurs also in many other Pindaric victory odes, is the theme of abilities being innate and inherited. The statements at the beginning of the second triad, about the glory of the Aeginetan heroes living on in the men of today (21-8), introduce this theme explicitly. The theme is resumed in the context of the references to the earlier victories of members of the victor's family (35-7). The avowed aim of the myth is to illustrate the power of inheritance, which it does because it describes the Epigonoi as having the same qualities as the Seven. The 'coda' underscores this theme compellingly in that, on top his father's martial qualities, Alcmaeon also appears to have inherited his mantic skills. The *gnome* that opens Amphiaraus' speech (44/5) and ϲυγγόνοιϲι τέχναιϲ at the very end of the 'coda' (60) make the theme explicit. In the closing prayer, finally, the theme is implicitly touched upon in that the gods and heroes mentioned in 99/100 belong to the same stock.

The second running theme is what may be called the correlation between ethically approved behaviour and success. The bipartite description of Hesychia's personality in the first triad introduces this theme. Hesychia acts mildly upon whoever does the same; she punishes *hybris* and unrelenting grudge. The exempla of Porphyrion and Typhos emphasize that *hybris* is punished. The first of the two gnomic statements (13/4) explicitly connects *hybris* with the unbridled pursuit of riches (κέρδοϲ), using force. The opening lines of the second triad express the positive side of this correlation. Aegina's δίκα and ἀρεταί (22) resulted in a 'spotless repute' (24/5) and in the island being sung about in many songs (25-7). The myth, then, problematizes the correlation, in the light of the moral dimension of the way in which the first expedition came to be. At first Adrastus seemed to get away with his repulsive behaviour, including his bribing of Eriphyle: after all, he was the only one to survive the debacle for which he was responsible, whereas Amphiaraus, the only one who wanted to act in accordance with what was pre-ordained by the gods, was killed. However, the balance is restored in the second generation. Adrastus is punished at long last as he loses his son, whereas Amphiaraus is rewarded in that he sees his son excelling in battle. Lines 70-3 connect the τύχαι of Aristomenes and his family with δίκα. In the final triad the changes of fortune are explicitly connected with morality: the annihilation of τὸ τερπνόν is presented as caused by a wrong moral disposition (ἀποτρόπωι γνώμαι, 94), just as ἔχων | κρέϲϲονα πλούτου μέριμναν (91/2) defines the mental attitude

required for success. The preceding passage about the right way of dealing with wealth (88-92) defines the commendable morality in terms of adherence to aristocratic principles. The emphasis on wealth echoes κέρδος in 13. Thus the 'new' principles of the money (embedded) economy, associated with the δῆμος and democratic ideology, are rejected as pursuit of wealth for its own sake (κέρδος) and closely associated with ὕβρις and βία (13-5), and opposed to the 'old' principles of the aristocratic (disembedded) economy that regards material goods as an instrument for acquiring immaterial rewards.

Thirdly, the ode recurrently describes contrasting behaviour in contrasting situations. Such a two-sidedness characterizes Hesychia (6/7, 8-12), Apollo (17-20, 61-6), Alcmaeon (45-7, 56-60), and the δαίμων (77/8). The emphasis upon Aristomenes' harsh side (81-7) has the function of attributing to him the same kind of two-sidedness. The two-sidedness is associated with the idea of καιρός, explicitly so in the case of Hesychia (7): it is the situation that defines which way of behaving is expedient to one's aims and purposes.

The relevance of these three themes to the encomiastic purpose of the ode, as well as some problematic passages, can be explained with the help of hypotheses, based on known historical facts, with respect to the probable consequences the current events had on the one hand for the internal political situation, and on the other for the relations between Aegina and Athens. As to the internal political situation, it is quite likely that, at the moment this ode was performed, the traditional elite had recently regained favourable perspectives, whereas pro-Athenian rulers attempted to maintain their power, and that, therefore, a situation coming close to στάσις was imminent. In this situation, the festivities in honour of Aristomenes had a fraternizing effect. Pindar intended to represent the momentary reconciliation caused by the festivities in honour of Aristomenes, and the readiness of all citizens to honour a member of the elite, which recalled the political set-up of before 457 B.C., as symbolizing the state of affairs desired by the traditional elite. πολέμων in 3 strongly suggests there is also an element of moral disqualification of the policy of Athens: lines 8-18, apart from alluding to the internal political situation, can also be read as referring to Aegina's dealings with Athens. This means that Pindar regarded the Athenian defeat at Coronea as the liberation of Aegina, which helps to explain why in 98/9 Pindar explicitly expresses his desire for the permanence of the freedom which Aegina has recently regained.

The representation of the current festivities for Aristomenes as symbolizing the restoration of political tranquility and of δίκα in the way the aristocrats perceive it, an idea all but explicitly present in

the opening triad and in lines 67-72, forms the connection between the three themes. The theme of the power of inheritance forms the core of aristocratic ideology. The repeated emphasis on contrasting ways of behaving oneself in contrasting situations serves as a recurrent reminder to the pro-Athenian elements in Pindar's audience that the restoration of the old political set-up can be accomplished in a smooth and peaceful manner, if they are willing to step down, but that, if they are not, a different situation will exist, a situation in which force will be the fitting way for the aristocracy to restore their power. Thus, the wish that the momentary reconciliation for the sake of the festivities prefigures a peaceful change of the political set-up has an overtly persuasive force. It is a straightforward imperative to pro-Athenian elements in the audience not to resist. By repeatedly associating Aristomenes' success and the momentary restoration of δίκα with divine pre-ordinance, Pindar suggests the aristocrats have the gods on their side, which conveys the suggestion to the pro-Athenians that any resistance on their part is hopeless. The explicit reference to the termination of divine favour in 77/8, drives the point home. The δαίμων draws the line for some, after he has favoured them for a while. The pro-Athenians are meant to feel concerned. The recurrent theme of the correlation between ethically approved behaviour and success, and its shadow-side, that morally repulsive behaviour is punished, aims at representing the recent favourable change of the aristocrats' perspectives as a reward for their adherence to morally just principles, and, *vice versa*, the crumbling of the power of Athens and pro-Athenian rulers in Aegina as a punishment for their morally repulsive attitude, stigmatized as unbridled pursuit of gain, not disinclined to the use of force that makes them guilty of *hybris*. The myth illustrates that these principles of reward and punishment may work in the long run, as applies to the case of Aegina.

Epilogue

Some have characterized *Pythian* VIII as a pessimistic ode. The scholiast remarks: ἐπιμέμφονταί τινες τῶι Πινδάρωι, ὅτι ἐγκώμιον γράφων θρηνεῖ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον (Σ. 136c, II 219 Dr.). Gildersleeve sums up: "We have here a tremulous poem with a melancholy note in the midst of joyousness" (p. 327).[63] Others have admired the

[63] "Das trübte die Stimmung," Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 439, cf. also p. 444. See also Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 215; Robbins, *Companion*, pp. 265-77, esp. pp. 276/7.

beauty and wisdom of Pindar's assessment of the *condition humaine*,—as Carne-Ross eloquently puts it: "All human joy, shooting up so fast, falls in the end, shattered, bafflingly, by 'averse dispose,' a fall that can nonetheless be borne because it is part of the universal rhythm of life. In the perspective which the poem creates, one that reaches beyond sorrow to some encompassing serenity, the fall of an ancient city at the aggressor's hands is as grave as the fall of the leaf, no more, no less, and as inevitable. Ripeness is all. And what is victory but the other face of defeat? The greatest poem of Pindar's that has come down to us, *Pythian* VIII shows how generous a scope this seemingly limited form can have" (*Pindar*, p. 189).

The perspective of the preceding discussion was more down to earth. I intended to demonstrate how the ode as a whole could have functioned as a successful epinicion on the occasion of its first performance, not isolating those passages that are widely admired for their beauty and wisdom from the over-all encomiastic objective. As I hope to have argued, the general tone of the poem is not pessimistic, an assumption that is, in itself, problematic in the light of the encomiastic purpose of the genre and the festive occasion in which it fulfilled its function. The general tone is in fact quite the opposite of pessimistic. Not only does this ode praise the young victor's achievement unreservedly, as one would expect, wholeheartedly fulfilling its function within the framework of the festivities for which it was composed, it also represents his victory as symbolizing the state of affairs that was very much desired by the group in the audience to which the victor and his family belong. The emphasis upon defeat as the other side of victory, a theme that indeed is very much present in this ode, derives the greater part of its relevance from the (then highly relevant) polarization between the aristocracy and the new ruling classes. Thus the overall tone of the poem is one of optimism and militant polarisation rather than one of melancholy.

The aristocratic Aeginetan hopes for recovery of their autonomy were to be frustrated almost as soon as they had been fed. In 446/5 B.C. the crumbling of the Athenian Empire came to an end due to the Thirty Years Peace, which entailed the Spartan recognition of the *status quo*—that is to say, Athens was denied its claim on Central Greece and the Peloponnese; however, Sparta did recognize the Athenian supremacy over its former ally Aegina.

Thus Pindar's Eighth *Pythian Ode* is, apart from being a great epinicion and a marvellous poem, quite a remarkable document, in that it reflects high hopes on the part of the Aeginetan aristocracy

with respect to the restoration of their power in that unique and very brief period of time, which from our distant historical perspective is hardly worth considering to be different from the entire period of Athens' domination of Aegina.

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Proem

1-20 Proem. Invocation of Hesychia
- **1-5** Invocation of Hesychia. Victory dedicated to her
  - **1-2** Invocation proper
  - **3-4** Hesychia's prerogatives (first part)
  - **5** Dedication: request to accept the victor's honour
- **6-20** Motivation. Hesychia's prerogatives (second part) [τὺ γάρ]
  - **6-7** Hesychia's mild side
  - **8-13** Hesychia's harsh side [τὺ δέ]
    - **8-12(a)** Hesychia opposing those who violate her principles
    - **12(b)-13(a)** illustrated by means of Porphyrion [relative pronoun]
  - **13(b)-15** Two gnomes illustrating that hybris is unsuccessful [δέ]
    - **13(b)-14** profit acquired by force will not be persistent
    - **15** the use of force will ruin even the most confident [δέ]
  - **16-18(a)** Application of gnomes to Typhos and Porphyrion [asynd.]
    - **16-17(a)** they could not avert their punishment
    - **17(b)-18(a)** as they were slain by Zeus and Apollo [δέ]
  - **18(b)-20** Apollo who recieved the victory procession in Delphi [relat.]

Praise

21-38 Praise of Aegina, the victor and his family
- **21-28** Praise of Aegina [δ']
  - **21-24(a)** Aegina is closely associated with the Graces
  - **24(b)-28** Aegina's fame [δ']
    - **24(b)-25(a)** It has a perfect renown from the beginning
    - **25(b)-28** Explanation of this claim [μὲν γάρ]
      - **25(b)-27** It is pre-eminent for its heroes of the past
      - **28** and for its men of to-day [τὰ δέ]
- **29-34** Break off ('too much to tell') [εἰμὶ δ']
  - **29-32(a)** 'I cannot tell the whole long story' about Aegina's glory
  - **32(b)-34** 'I must praise the victory' [δέ]
- **35-38** The victor continues the successes of his family [γάρ]
  - **35-37** 'He did not refute the reputation of his uncles'
  - **38** In elevating his clan he qualifies for Amphiaraus' word being applied to him' [δέ]

Narrative: Myth and 'Coda'

39-56(a) Myth. The Epigonoi at Thebes [τὸν ὅνπερ ποτ']
- **39-43** Introduction of Amphiaraus' speech, giving the narrative setting
  - **39-42** Defining elaboration of λόγον
  - **43** Opening speech cap.

44-55(a) Amphiaraus' speech [direct speech]
44-47 The power of inherited excellence
44-45(a) Gnomic opening statement about the power of inherited excellence
45(b)-47 Alcmaeon's prowess, illustrating the preceding gnome [asynd.]
48-55(a) Prophecy about the outcoming of the battle, focussing on Adrastus [ὁ δέ]
48-51(a) Favourable part of the prophecy: 'Where he failed before, Adrastus will now have success'
51(b)-55 Unfavourable part of the prophecy
51(b)-52(a) 'At home he will fare aversely' [τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν]
52(b)-55(a) Explanation of the preceding prophecy: 'His son will be the only casualty' [γάρ]
55(b)-56(a) Closing speech cap.
56(b)-60 'Coda.' Alcmaeon's epiphany to the poet [χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτός]
56(b)-57 'I too praise Alcmaeon' like a victor
58-60 Explanation [ὅτι]
58-59 'because he met me on the road to Delphi'
60 'and gave a prophecy' [τ']

Prayer to Apollo
61-78(a) Prayer to Apollo
61-66 Invocation of Apollo with prerogatives and hypomnesis [τὺ δ']
61-63 Invocation with prerogatives: Apollo as the Lord of Delphi
64-66 Hypomnesis: 'You have favoured the victor before'
64-65(a) 'You have granted him a victory in Delphi' [μέν]
65(b)-66 'and before at your Games in Aegina' [δέ]
67-72 Renewed invocation and request [ὦναξ ... δ']
67-69 First, veiled formulation of the request: 'provide a certain harmony everywhere where I come'
70-72 More specific re-formulation of the request
70-71(a) 'Now there is (temporarily) a situation of δίκα' [μέν]
71(b)-72 Prayer that this may remain so in the future [δέ]
73-78(a) Motivation of the prayer [γάρ]
73-75 The wrong view of the πολλοί
73 Protasis: the situation, now existing, for the continuation of which the poet prays
74-75 Apodosis: 'the πολλοί think this is cleverness'
76-78(a) How things really are [δ']
76(a) 'This does not lie in the hands of men'
76(b)-78 'The δαίμων decides this' [δέ]
76(b)-77(a) 'The δαίμων favours now one now another'
77(b)-78(a) 'by disfavouring someone he draws the line'

Praise
78(b)-80 Earlier victories (remainder)
  78(b)-79(a) Megara and Marathon [δ']
    78(b) Megara
    79(a) Marathon [τ']
  79(b)-80 Three victories in the Aeginetan Heraea [τ']
81-87 The most recent victory
  81-82 The victor's superiority over his opponents [δ']
  83-87 The misery of his defeated opponents [relat.]
    83-84 'Their home-coming was not as sweet as the victor's'
    85-87 Specification [οὐδέ]
      85-86(a) 'On their return there was no joy and laughter'
      86(b)-87 'They hide in back-streets, bitten by misfortune' [δ']
88-92(a) The proper way of dealing with wealth
  88-91(a) 'Someone who, in prosperity, wins a καλόν gains fame' [ὁ δέ]
  91(b)-92(a) Condition for this to happen [ptc.]
92(b)-97 The variability of fortune
  92(b)-94 The quick changes of fortune [δ']
    92(b)-93(a) 'Good fortune may come quickly'
    93(b)-94 'Bad fortune just as quickly' [οὕτω δὲ καί]
  95-96(a) The consequence of this for the *condition humaine* [asynd.]
    95(a) One word assessment of the *condition humaine*
    95(b) Question: 'What, then, can man be said to be?' [δέ]
      95(b) 'What is someone?'
      95(c) 'What is someone not?' [δ']
    95(d)-96(a) Answer: 'Of shadow a dream is man' [asynd.]
  96(b)-97 'God-given gleam' is more permanent [ἀλλ']
98-100 Prayer to Aegina

METRICAL ANALYSIS

Strophe/Antistrophe

1	⏑⏑⏑—⏑⏑⁝—⁝⏑—‖	⏑⏑⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—‖	⏑⏑sds‖
2	—⏑—⏑⏑⁝⏑⏑⏑—‖	—⏑—⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑—‖	sd⏑⏑s‖ *vel* ss⏑⏑d‖ *vel* s'⏑⏑s⏑⏑–‖
3	——⏑⁝—⏑⏑—‖	×—⏑⁝—⏑⏑—‖	×sd‖
4	⏑—⏑⁝——⏑⁝⏑—⁝⏑—‖	×—⏑——⏑⏑—⏑—‖	×s'ds‖ *vel* ‸ss'ds‖
5	—⏑⏑⁝——⁝⏒—⏑⁝—⏑⏑—⁝⏑—‖	—⏑⏑—×⁝×—⏑⁝—⏑⏑—⁝⏑—‖	d××sds‖
6	⏒—⏑⁝—⏑⏑⁝——⁝⏒—⁝⏑—⁝⏑—‖	×—⏑—⏑⏑—×⁝×—⏑—⏑—‖	×sd××ss‖
7	⏒—⏑—⁝⏒⁝—⁝⏑—⏑—⦀	×—⏑—×—⏑—⏑—⦀	×s×ss⦀

Epode

1	⏑—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑——⏑—⏑—‖	×—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑——⏑—⏑—‖	×sds'ss‖ *vel* ‸ssds'ss‖
2	——⏑—⏑⏑——⁝⏒—⏑⁝⏑——‖	×—⏑—⏑⏑—××—⏑⏑——‖	×sd××d–‖
3	—⏒⁝—⏑⏑—⏑⁝——|——⏑⏑——‖	××—⏑⏑—⏑⁝—×|×—⏑⏑——‖	××ds××d–‖
4	——⏑⁝⏑—⁝—⏑⏑—⁝⏑—|⏑—‖	×—⏑⏑——⏑⏑—⏑—|⏑—‖	×d'ds‖
5	⏑——⏑⁝⏑—⏑⁝—⁝—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—‖	××—⏑⁝⏑—⏑⁝——⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—‖	××ds'sds‖ *vel* ‸s'ds'sds‖
6	——⁝⏒—⁝⏒—⏑⏑⁝—⏑—⏑⁝——⦀	××××⁝×—⏑⏑—⏑—⏑⁝——⦀	×××××dss–⦀

Remarks

The ode has five triads. All verses are heterogenous with the exception of str. 7 (and possibly str. 2). Most verses have more than one alternation between single short and double short elements. The sequence dd does not occur; only in ep. 4 we have d'd. There is variation of prolongation and juxtapostion. Most verses begin with a rising rhythm (the exceptions being str. 1, 2 and 5). Most verses have a blunt ending (the exceptions being ep. 2, 3, 6 and possibly str. 2). Many verses begin with one or more ancipitia. Often we have one or two ancipitia in the course of the verse. Odes of this type are traditionally characterized as 'aeolic.' For the characteristics of these 'aeolica' see further Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, pp. 167-72 (§ 6.3). For an interpretation of the metrical structure of this ode see *ibid.* pp. 176-8 (§ 6.6).

Str. 1 has hardly been articulated by means of preferred word ends. Word ends are relatively free: the preferred word ends indicated occur only four out of ten times.

Str. 2 has a preferred word end after the fifth syllable, which has been realized five out of ten times. No word end occurs between the three final syllables.

Str. 3 is quite strictly articulated: it has a preferred word end after the third syllable, which has been realized seven out of ten times; word end is relatively rare in the other positions.

Str. 4 has a preferred word end before the penultimate syllable, realized five times. Both other preferred word ends indicated have been realized four times.

Str. 5, again, is strictly articulated: it has three preferred word ends which have been realized eight, seven, and eight times respectively. The preferred word end after the third syllable occurs four times. No word end occurs between the ninth and the tenth syllable, nor between the eleventh and the twelfth. The sixth syllable is unambiguously long in the first two triads and line 85. The interpretation of this verse as d's̄sdsll is problematic because then we have to assume a number of licences in the responsion.

Str. 6 has six preferred positions for word end to occur: it occurs four times after the third syllable, five times after the sixth, eight times after the eighth, four times after the tenth, and five times before the penultimate syllable. No word end occurs between the seventh and the eighth syllable. The ninth syllable is short only in lines 6, 33, and 93. The interpretation of this verse as ×sd's̄ssll is problematic because then we have to assume a number of licences in the responsion.

Str. 7 has preferred word ends after the fourth and after the sixth syllable (both occurring five times). Word end occurs four times after the fifth syllable. The fifth syllable is long in lines 7, 27, 54, and 94. Snell-Maehler doubt if there is cholosis of the penultimate single short element in line 47. Since this would be the only example of cholosis in that position in this verse, it is preferable to interpret Κάδμου as ⏑— (cf. West, *Greek Metre*, n. 30; Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, p. 177 n. 64). The interpretation of this verse as ×ss̄ss||| is problematic because then we have to assume a number of licences in the responsion.

Ep. 1 is not articulated by preferred word ends. Snell-Maehler doubt if the eighth syllable is long in line 35; it is, however, preferable to interpret ἰχνεύων as —⏑— (taking the *ypsilon* as a consontant). Also they doubt if the eleventh syllable is long in line 55; it is, however, preferable to interpret τοιαῦτα as ⏑—⏑ (taking the *iota* as a consonant). If we interpret both syllables as longs, we would have to interpret this verse as ⏑—⏑—⏑⏑—××××—⏑—|| (so: ‸ssd××××s||, or ×sd××××s||). Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, p. 177, accepts the ambiguity only for the eighth syllable and arrives at the interpretation ×sd××ss|||.

Ep. 2 has two preferred word ends (both occurring thrice). No word end occurs directly before these preferred word ends. The ninth syllable is long in 56 and 76. The interpretation of this verse as ×sd's̄d–|| is problematic because then we have to assume a number of licences in the responsion.

Ep. 3 has a fixed word end after the ninth syllable. No word end occurs in the positions directly preceding and following this fixed word end. There is a preferred word end after the seventh syllable (not realized in line 17). The word end after the second syllable has been realized three out of five times. The second syllable is unambiguously long in lines 57 (proper name) and 97. The interpretation of this verse as ××ds's̄d–|| is in itself possible, but has the disadvantage of assuming cholosis which does not occur elsewhere in this ode.

Ep. 4 has a fixed word end before the penultimate syllable. No word occurs in the position preceding it. The other preferred word ends indicated occur three out of five times.

Ep. 5 has two preferred word ends in the first half of the verse. The word end after the fourth syllable has not been realized in line 79 (proper name); after the seventh not in 39 (proper name). No word end occurs between these two preferred word ends, nor in the position preceding the first. The word end after the eighth syllables occurs three out of five times. Sicking, *Griechische Verslehere*, p. 177, interprets this verse as ××ds××ds||| (giving the interpretation advocated here as an alternative).

Ep. 6 has four preferred positions for word end to occur: word end occurs three times after the second syllable, four times after the fourth (not in 100), three times after the eighth, and four times before the penultimate syllable (not in 100, proper name). No word end occurs in the positions directly preceding these preferred word ends, nor between the fifth and the sixth syllable. The third and fifth syllables are short only in lines 60 and 100. In other words, this verse scans ———————⏑⏑ ... in 20, 40, and 80, while it scans ——⏑—⏑—⏑⏑ ... in 60 and 100. This only allows for the interpretation ×××××dss–|||. The interpretation of this verse as ×s̄s̄dss–||| (given as an alternative by Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, p. 177), or ×s̄×dss–|||, is problematic because then we have to assume a number of licences in the responsion.

Interpretation

Str. 1 can be reduced to the basic sequence sds. This sequence will occur a number of times in this ode and can be called a 'theme' which determines the rhythmical profile of the ode.

Str. 2 is a repetition of str. 1 with the resolution in a different position (˜sds|| → sd˜s|||). However, the five short syllables in a row result in a great deal of ambiguity (the verse could also be interpreted as ss˜d||, or as s'˜s˜–||), so as to camouflage the repetition.

Str. 3 is a shortened, rising variation on the sds 'theme,' omitting the second single short element. The preferred word end effects a variation of a rising and a falling rhythm: ×⃗—⏑⁞⏑⏑—||.

Str. 4 is, again, a rising variation on the sds 'theme,' now without omission of the second single short element. Variation is further effected by means of juxtaposition. The preferred word end before the penultimate syllable marks the clausula ⏑—||, which will be echoed a number of times in this ode.

Str. 5 singles out the double short element from the 'theme' sds; then, after two ancipitia, we get the 'theme' in its pure form. Where the sixth syllable is short, there is ambiguity: —⏑⏑——⏑—⏑—⏑⏑ —⏑—|| seems to represent d'ssds|| rather than d××sds||. The preferred word ends, again, are constitutive of a variation of a falling and a rising rhythm: ⏑⏑—×⁞×⃗—⏑⁞⏑⏑—⁞⏑⃗—||. The preferred word end before the penultimate syllable stresses the clausula, which is an echo of the preceding verse.

Str. 6 begins as an echo of str. 3. The preferred word end between the two ancipitia in fact characterizes the first half of this verse as a pendant variation on str. 3. Then, after two ancipitia,

we get the sequence ss. This is a new 'theme,' although it was implicitly present—not to say hidden—in str. 2 (which allows for the interpretation ss⏑⏑d‖ or s'⏑⏑s⏑⏑–‖) and str. 4 (which allows for the interpretation ‸ss'ds‖). Again, we have the clausula ⏑—‖, emphasized by a preferred word end directly preceding it.

Str. 7 further explores the new 'theme' (ss) which was introduced at the end of the preceding verse. The rising rhythm is stressed by the preferred word ends: x⃗—⏑—⁝x⃗—⁝⏑⃗—⏑—⫴. This recalls the introduction of the ss 'theme' in str. 6, where the preferred word end effected a rising rhythm too. Again, we have the clausula, but here it is not stressed by means of a preferred word end.

Ep. 1 combines the two 'themes' we have encountered in the strophe/antistrophe: we get a rising variation of the 'theme' sds, continued by means of juxtaposition as ss. Again we have the clausula, and again unmarked.

Ep. 2 begins as an echo of str. 6 (and thus also of str. 3). But here, after the two ancipitia, we do not get a single short sequence but a pendant double short element. Where the ninth syllable is short we get ambiguity: ——⏑—⏑⏑——⏑—⏑⏑——‖ seems to represent ×sd'sd–‖ (a repetition of str. 3, followed by a falling, pendant variation on str. 3) rather than ×sd××d–‖.

Ep. 3 is a complex variation on ep. 2: it inverts the single and double short elements in the first half of the verse, adding an extra anceps at the beginning; the second half of the verse is identical to the second half of ep. 2. The ending with a double short element recalls, apart from ep. 2, also str. 3. Where the second syllable is short, there is ambiguity: —⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—————⏑⏑——⫴ seems to represent sds××d–‖ (an echo of the sds 'theme') rather than ××ds××d–‖. The fixed word end singles out the sequence ×d–‖, which will be echoed at the beginning of the next verse.

Ep. 4 begins as an echo of the second halfs of ep. 2 and ep. 3. An extra double short element is added by means of juxtaposition. This is the only verse in this ode where we find more than one double short element in a row. The second half of the verse resumes the 'theme' ss, which we already heard in str. 6, 7 and ep. 1. The fixed word end emphasizes the clausula ⏑—‖, which is an echo of str. 4, 5, 6 (as well as str. 7 and ep. 1), and adds to the impression that the system comes to a conclusion.

Ep. 5 brings us home. Interpreted as ××ds'sds‖, it is an echo of the beginning of ep. 3 combined with the 'theme' sds in its pure form. Interpreted as ‸s'ds'sds‖, it represents this theme twice: first with two variations (rising beginning and juxtaposition), then un-

mutilated. Again we have the clausula, though unmarked. All this gives a feeling of the closure of the triad being imminent.

Ep. 6, then, is the grand finale, almost some kind of coda. The sequence ×dss–|||, marked by the preferred word end after the fourth syllable, is a rising, pendant variation on the second half of ep. 4. Three out of five times the verse scans ———————⏑⏑ —⏑—⏑——|||. The six long syllables in a row completely obscure the rhythmical pattern. In lines 60 and 100 the verse scans ——⏑—⏑ —⏑⏑—⏑—⏑——|||, which seems a representation of ×ssdss–|||, an elaborated, lengthened variation on the 'theme' sds in combination with the other 'theme' ss. With this interpretation the concluding verse of the triad is symmetrical: ——⏑—⏑, —⏑⏑—, ⏑—⏑—— (cf. Sicking, p. 178).

Conclusion

The metrical profile of the ode is determined by variations on two 'themes': sds (—⏑—⏑⏑—⏑—) and ss (—⏑—⏑—). The former is introduced in str. 1; it is varied upon in several ways in str. 2, 3, and 4. In str. 5 the double short element which forms the centre of this 'theme' is singled out before we get the 'theme' in itself, for the first time in its basic form. Str. 6 echoes str. 3 and introduces the new 'theme' ss, which is further explored in str. 7.

In the epode the pattern becomes more complex. Ep. 1 combines the two 'themes.' Ep. 2 and 3 each begin with different, shortened variations of the sds 'theme' and end with a pendant double short element. Characteristic in these verses is the ambiguity that ensues from the realization of ancipitia as short syllables: ep. 2 sometimes seems to represent ×sd'sd–||, a repetition of str. 3, followed by a falling, pendant variation on str. 3; ep. 3 sometimes sounds like sds××d–||, echoing the sds 'theme.' Ep. 4 begins as an echo of the second halfs of ep. 2 and ep. 3. An extra double short element is added by means of juxtaposition. The second half of the verse resumes the 'theme' ss. In ep. 5, then, we have ambiguity again: it may be interpreted as an echo of the beginning of ep. 3, followed by the sds 'theme'; alternatively it may be taken as a double repetition of this theme. Ep. 6 ends with a pendant variation of the second half of ep. 4, incorporating the ss 'theme.' The beginning of ep. 6, however, is highly ambiguous. In three triads we have no less than six long syllables in a row. In the other triads the verse sounds like ×ssdss–|||, which is an expanded variation on the sds 'theme' and at the same time echoes the ss 'theme.'

Apart from this there is a clausula effect. The clausula ⏑—‖ is emphasized by preferred word ends in str. 1, 4, 5, 6, and by a fixed word end in ep. 4. It further occurs unmarked in all the other verses with the exception of ep. 2, 3, and 6.

COMMENTARY

Strophe A

1-5

Kind-hearted Tranquility, daughter of 'The Way It Should Be', you, who make mightiest cities and hold the highest keys of counsels and wars, accept for Aristomenes the honour of Pythian victory.

1-2. φιλόφρον Ἡϲυχία, Δίκαϲ | ὦ μεγιϲτόπολι θύγατερ

The way in which Hesychia is described in 1-4 makes clear unequivocally that she represents a political idea. She stands for tranquility within the *polis:* and as such she contrasts not only situations of internal conflict, ϲτάϲιϲ, but also situations of external conflict, as πολέμων in line 3 makes clear.

For the former contrast cf. τὸ κοινόν τιϲ ἀϲτῶν ἐν εὐδίαι | τιθεὶϲ ἐρευναϲάτω | μεγαλάνοροϲ Ἡϲυχίαϲ τὸ φαιδρὸν φάοϲ, | ϲτάϲιν ἀπὸ πραπίδοϲ ἐπίκοτον ἀνελών, | πενίαϲ δότειραν, ἐχθρὰν κουροτρόφον *fr.*109; ἡϲυχίαι θιγέμεν, | μήτ' ὦν τινι πῆμα πορών, ἀπαθὴϲ δ' αὐτὸϲ πρὸϲ ἀϲτῶν, *P.*4.296/7. For the latter cf. νεόπολίϲ εἰμι· ματρὸϲ δὲ ματέρ' ἐμᾶϲ ἔτεκον ἔμπαν | πολεμίωι πυρὶ πλαγεῖϲαν. | εἰ δέ τιϲ ἀρκέων φίλοιϲ | ἐχθροῖϲι τραχὺϲ ὑπαντιάζει, | μόχθοϲ ἡϲυχίαν φέρει καιρῶι καταβαίνων, *Pae.*2.28-34. For the opposition ἡϲυχία *vs.* ὕβριϲ in a context of peace and war, cf. ϲύν τοι τίν (*sc.* Zeus) κεν ἁγητὴρ ἀνήρ, | υἱῶι τ' ἐπιτελλόμενοϲ, δᾶμον γεραίρων τράποι ϲύμφωνον ἐϲ ἡϲυχίαν. | λίϲϲομαι νεῦϲον, Κρονίων, ἥμερον | ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοίνιξ ὁ Τυρϲανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸϲ ἔχηι, ναυϲίϲτονον ὕβριν ἰδὼν τὰν πρὸ Κύμαϲ, | οἷα Cυρακοϲίων ἀρχῶι δαμαϲθέντεϲ πάθον, | ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὅ ϲφιν ἐν πόντωι βάλεθ' ἁλικίαν, | Ἑλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείαϲ δουλίαϲ, *P.*1.69-75, where ναυϲίϲτονον ὕβριν refers to the violence of the barbarians at Cumae (cf. Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 136).[1]

Hesychia is qualified as **μεγιϲτόπολιϲ**. This compound adjective serves to associate the concepts μέγιϲτοϲ and πόλιϲ with Hesychia: the power of cities (for μέγαϲ with this connotation, cf. *P.*4.19, 48, 5.16, *N.*9.17, etc.; for the compound adjective cf. *P.*2.1) is related to political tranquility. That such a political climate would make it easier for a *polis* to obtain prosperity—and that its opposite, e.g., ϲτάϲιϲ,

---

[1] On ἡϲυχία see also L.B. Carter, *The Quiet Athenian* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 42-7; he argues that later in the fifth century ἡϲυχία was used by those who were opposed to Athenian imperialism as a characterization of their ideology and that 'to such people the aggressive imperialism of Athens was the striving of overweening ambition, of baneful *hybris*' (p. 47). Dunbar on Ar.*Av.*1320-2 (p. 649) notes that Ἡϲυχία is especially associated with the ideals of Dorian cities (citing Th.6.34.4). See also Dunbar's note on 44 (p. 151).

is bad for a *polis*—is obvious, and is explicitly stated in *fr.*109 (*v.s.*), cf. Ἡϲυχίαν φιλόπολιν, *O.*4.20; *P.*4.296/7 (*v.s.*). Cf. also τό τε τῆϲ ἀγανόφρονοϲ Ἡϲυχίαϲ | εὐήμερον πρόϲωπον, Ar.*Av.*1321/2; cf. also E.*fr.*453 N., where Εἰρήνη, as opposed to ϲτάϲιϲ, is associated with prosperity.

Δίκα means 'the way it should be.' A manifestation of Δίκα is the willingness to conform to generally accepted standards in case of conflict and not to use violence, i.e., to avoid ὕβριϲ (cf. line 12) and βία (cf. line 15). So it is Dika who must see to it that the members of a society recognize the division of power and property as agreed upon and do not attempt to increase their own power and/or property by means of violence.

Cf. e.g. ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένεϲ ὠκύτεραι | κέρδοϲ αἰνῆϲαι πρὸ δίκαϲ δόλιον τραχεῖαν ἑρπόντων πρὸϲ ἔπιβδαν ὅμωϲ, *P.*4.139/40. Dika's sister (*O.*13.6), Eunomia, is ἀπόλεμοϲ (*P.*5.67). It is instructive to compare Thgn.39-52, where ϲτάϲιϲ, ἡϲυχίη, δίκη, and ὕβριϲ all occur as key words in the description of the internal political situation in a πόλιϲ. ἡϲυχίη, a situation of political tranquility and stability, is contrasted to a situation in which the δίκαι, the arrangements concerning how things are to be done, are given to the ἄδικοι to manipulate for the sake of their own personal profit and power (45/6, 50). This implies ὕβριϲ (44), and means the destruction of the city (45), for it will result in ϲτάϲιϲ and bloodshed (51). For the opposition of δίκη and ὕβριϲ, cf. Hes.*Op.*190/1, 213, 217, 225, 238, *Od.*6.120, Archil.177.3/4, Thgn.291/2, 378/9, 751, Xenoph.B.1.15-7, etc.

As δίκα is often invoked in justification of maintaining the existing situation or of returning to a previous status quo, it carries conservative connotations (cf. ἀρχοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἔϲαν Ταλαοῦ παῖδεϲ, βιαϲθέντεϲ λύαι. | κρέϲϲων δὲ καππαύει δίκαν τὰν πρόϲθεν ἀνήρ, *N.*9.14/5). See further my note on 70/1 below (pp. 565/6).

•*Literature:* On Δίκα in Pindar see especially: Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, p. 43, 68; Maehler, *Dichterberuf*, pp. 81-101 (esp. pp. 83-8); Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, esp. pp. 85-159; Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, p. 279; Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 14, 1961, 45/6. For Δίκα in general, see Thummer, *Religiosität*, pp. 109-116. The most recent discussion of δίκη in Homer and Hesiod is by Yamagata, *Homeric Morality*, esp. pp. 61-92; further references are to be found therein.

For **φιλόφρων**, 'kindly disposed, friendly,' cf. *P.*1.94, A.*Pers.*96-8; τὸν ϲτρατηγὸν εἶναι χρὴ ... καὶ φιλόφρονά τε καὶ ὠμόν, X.*Mem.*3.1.6 (cf. *Smp.*8.16), etc. Cf. also ϲὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν | ἴϲχειν ἐν ϲτήθεϲϲι· φιλοφροϲύνη γὰρ ἀμείνων· | ληγέμεναι δ' ἔριδοϲ κακομηχάνου, *Il.*9.255-7. Cf. also ἀγανόφρων in Ar.*Av.*1321/2 (quoted above). For the deity 'kindly' receiving the dedication cf. ϲὺν δὲ φιλοφροϲύναιϲ εὐηράτοιϲ Ἁγηϲία δέξαιτο κῶμον, *O.*6.98; καρδίαι γελανεῖ | ... δέκευ, *O.*5.2/3; ἵλαοϲ ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε ϲὺν εὐμενίαι | δέξαι ϲτεφάνωμα τόδ', *P.*12.4/5; εὔφρων δέξεται, *P.*9.73; ἵλεῴι νιν ὁ Δα̣[λ]ογενὴϲ υἱὸϲ βαθυζώνο̣[ιο] Λατοῦϲ | δέκτ[ο] βλεφά̣[ρω]ι, B.11.15-7.

• *Genealogies of Moral Concepts:* By referring to Hesychia as Dika's daughter, Pindar states that political tranquility depends upon the recognition of Dika, i.e., upon the maintenance or the restoration of a division of power and property that has been agreed upon.

The most elaborate genealogical representation of moral concepts in Pindar is: ἐν τᾶι (*sc.* Corinth) γὰρ Εὐνομία ναίει κασιγνήτα τε, βάθρον πολίων ἀcφαλέc, | Δίκα καὶ ὁμότροφος Εἰρήνα, τάμι' ἀνδράcι πλούτου, | χρύcεαι παῖδες εὐβούλου Θέμιτοc· | ἐθέλοντι δ' ἀλέξειν | Ὕβριν, Κόρου ματέρα θραcύμυθον, *O.*13.6-10. The presentation aims at interconnecting the desirable concepts Eunomia, Dika, Eirena, and Themis, and at setting them off against Hybris and Koros, the negative forces. More specifically, the genealogical presentation gives voice to the idea of Εὐνομία, 'abiding to laws,' Δίκα, 'the maintenance of the division of power and property that has been agreed upon,' and Εἰρήνα, 'peace,' depending upon Θέμιc.

This is a reversal of the proverbial genealogy: τίκτει γάρ, ὥcπερ φηcὶν ἡ παροιμία, κόροc μὲν ὕβριν, Arist.*fr.*57 R. (*Paroem. Gr.* ii.774.1). This proverb is found in Solon: δῆμοc δ' ὧδ' ἂν ἄριcτα cὺν ἡγεμόνεccιν ἕποιτο, | μήτε λίην ἀνεθεὶc μήτε βιαζόμενοc· | τίκτει τοι κόροc ὕβριν, ὅταν πολὺc ὄλβοc ἕπηται | ἀνθρώποιc ὁπόcοιc μὴ νόοc ἄρτιοc ἦι, Sol.*fr.*6 W., and Theognis: τίκτει τοι κόροc ὕβριν, ὅταν κακῶι ὄλβοc ἕπηται | ἀνθρώπωι καὶ ὅτωι μὴ νόοc ἄρτιοc ἦι, Thgn.153/4.[2] Cf. also δῖα Δίκη cβέccει κρατερὸν Κόρον, Ὕβριοc υἱόν, Bacis *ap.* Hdt.8.77. "That is an opposite point of view of the same circumstances—you may say that it is excess of worldly goods which leads to arrogance of character, but you may also say that it is the man whose character is given to arrogance who allows his prosperity to pass the limits of moderation" (Denniston & Page on A.*Ag.*757-62).[3]

For Eunomia cancelling out Hybris see also Εὐνομίη δ' εὔκοcμα καὶ ἄρτια πάντ' ἀποφαίνει, | καὶ θαμὰ τοῖc ἀδίκοιc ἀμφιτίθηcι πέδαc· | τραχέα λειαίνει, παύει κόρον, ὕβριν ἀμαυροῖ, | αὐαίνει δ' ἄτηc ἄνθεα φυόμενα, | εὐθύνει δὲ δίκαc cκολιάc, ὑπερήφανά τ' ἔργα | πραΰνει· παύει δ' ἔργα διχοcταcίηc, | παύει δ' ἀργαλέηc ἔριδοc χόλον, ἔcτι δ' ὑπ' αὐτῆc | πάντα κατ' ἀνθρώπουc ἄρτια καὶ πινυτά, Sol.*fr.*4.32-9 W.

---

[2] Cόλωνοc δὲ ποιήcαντοc "τίκτει τοι κόροc ὕβριν, ὅταν πολὺc ὄλβοc ἕπηται", ἄντικρυc ὁ Θέογνιc γράφει· "τίκτει τοι κόροc ὕβριν, ὅταν κακῶι ὄλβοc ἕπηται", Clem.*Strom.*6.8.7. It must be admitted that the emphatic depreciation of wealth in the hands of a κακόc is very typical for Theognis, which pleads in favour of Clemens' scenario. The difference between both versions becomes somewhat less spectacular when the next line in both versions is taken into account too. Then the difference is just a slight difference in emphasis, which is still compatible with Clemens' scenario. For further adaptations of the proverb see West's apparatus at Sol.*fr.*6.

[3] Pindar's reversal of the genealogy in *O.*13 has, of course, little to do with the Greek custom of grandmother and granddaughter often bearing the same name, as it is suggested by Gildersleeve on *O.*13.10 (pp. 229/30).

For similar genealogical presentations, cf., e.g., Ἀλαλά, Πολέμου θύγατερ, *fr.*78.1; θυγάτηρ | Ἀλάθεια Διός, *O.*10.3/4; *O.*8.1. For the personification of Hesychia cf. also ἁ δ' Ἁσυχία χαρίεσσα γυνά, καὶ Σωφροσύνας πλατίον οἰκεῖ, Epicharm.*fr.* 101 (Kaibel); Ar.*Av.*1321/2 (quoted above). There is no evidence of any altar for Hesychia (such as for Ὁμόνοια and for Καιρός in Olympia, Paus.5.14.9, or for Ἔλεος in Athens, Paus.1.17.1). Cf. H. Usener, *Götternamen*, Frankfurt am Main 1948[3], p. 266 n. 47. On personification see also my note on *N.*5.16/7; further references are given at the end of that note.

• *Literature:* See further D.H. Abel, 'Genealogies of Ethical Concepts from Hesiod to Bacchylides', *TAPhA* 74, 1943, 92-101; Carne-Ross, *Pindar*, pp. 169/70; R.E. Doyle, '"Ὄλβος, Κόρος, Ὕβρις and Ἄτη from Hesiod to Aeschylus', *Traditio* 26, 1970, 293-303; Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, esp. pp. 551-7.

For the position of ὦ, cf. μᾶτερ ὦ χρυσοστεφάνων ἀέθλων, *O.*8.1; μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι, *P.*2.1.

3-4. βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων | ἔχοισα κλαῖδας ὑπερτάτας

'Holding the highest keys of counsels and wars.' Hesychia is portrayed as the highest authority deciding whether a conflict is to be settled by counsels or by war.

'Counsels and wars' often appear together, as the two alternative ways to settle a conflict. Cf. τὶν (*sc.* by Tycha) γὰρ ἐν πόντωι κυβερνῶνται θοαὶ | νᾶες, ἐν χέρσωι τε λαιψηροὶ πόλεμοι | κἀγοραὶ βουλαφόροι, *O.*12.3-5. To excel both in fighting and in counseling is a requirement for the Homeric hero: ὢ πόποι ἦ δὴ μυρί' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργε | βουλάς τ' ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς πόλεμόν τε κορύσσων, *Il.*2.272/3; *Il.*9.53/4, 12.211-4, 1.258. Cf. also οὔτέ ποτ' ἐν πολέμωι ἐναρίθμιος οὔτ' ἐνὶ βουλῆι, *Il.*2.202, etc. In Pindar, to say that someone excels in both is a familiar *topos* of praise: ἔβλαστεν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνώνας βασιλεὺς | χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος, *N.*8.7/8 (cf. *Il.*16.630); νεότατι μὲν ἀρήγει θράσος | δεινῶν πολέμων· ὅθεν φαμὶ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, | τὰ μὲν ἐν ἱπποσόαισιν ἄνδρεσσι μαρνάμενον, τὰ δ' ἐν πεζομάχαισι· βουλαὶ δὲ πρεσβύτεραι | ἀκίνδυνον ἐμοὶ ἔπος ⟨σὲ⟩ ποτὶ πάντα λόγον | ἐπαινεῖν παρέχοντι, *P.*2.63-7; cf. also *fr.*199.1/2. For the two alternatives in a situation of conflict, cf., e.g., καίτοι ἐώθασι Ἕλληνες, ὡς πυνθάνομαι, ἀβουλότατα πολέμους ἵστασθαι ὑπό τε ἀγνωμοσύνης καὶ σκαιότητος. ... τοὺς χρῆν, ἐόντας ὁμογλώσσους, κήρυξί τε διαχρεωμένους καὶ ἀγγέλοισι καταλαμβάνειν τὰς διαφορὰς καὶ παντὶ μᾶλλον ἢ μάχηισι, Hdt.7.9β. Similarly, Pericles says of the Spartans βούλονθαι δὲ πολέμωι μᾶλλον ἢ λόγοις τὰ ἐγκλήματα διαλύεσθαι, Th.1.140.2 (cf. also Th.1.34, 1.144.2); χρῆν δ' αὐτὸν οὐχ ὅπλοισι τὰς διαλλαγάς, | μῆτερ, ποιεῖσθαι· πᾶν γὰρ ἐξαιρεῖ λόγος | ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολεμίων δράσειεν ἄν, E.*Poen.*515-7; πειρήσω δ' ἐπέεσσι παροίτερον ἀντιβολήσας, | εἴ κ' ἐθέλοι φιλότητι δέρος χρύσειον ὀπάσσαι, | ἦε καὶ οὔ, πίσυνος δὲ βίηι μετιόντας ἀτίσσει. | ὧδε γὰρ ἐξ αὐτοῖο πάρος κακότητα δαέντες | φρασσόμεθ', εἴτ' ἄρηι συνοισόμεθ', εἴτε τις ἄλλη | μῆτις ἐπίρροθος ἔσται ἐεργομένοισιν ἀυτῆς. | μηδ' αὔτως ἀλκῆι, πρὶν ἔπεσσί γε πειρηθῆναι, A.R.3.179-85. Cf. further Th.5.18, X.*HG* 3.5.22, etc. An example an in-

dividual weighing these alternatives is Hector in *Il.*22.99-130, considering whether it is better to reason with Achilles or to fight him. See further L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci*, (*Relazioni interstatali nel mondo antico. Fonti estudi* 1), 2 vols., Pisa 1973, who collects evidence for a variety of arbitrations, mediations and negotiated third-party settlements in a series of case studies.

κλαῖδας: Hesychia is presented as the κληιδοῦχος of counsels and war. For the κληιδοῦχος θεός cf. A.*Eu.*827/8, Ar.*Thes.*1141/2 (of Athena), and E.*Hipp.*538-40 (of Eros). Pindar uses a similar metaphor in κρυπταὶ κλαΐδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς | Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν φιλοτάτων, *P.*9.39/39a.

For the metaphor, cf. also: ἀχάριστος ὄλοιθ', ὅτῳ πάρεστιν | μὴ φίλους τιμᾶν καθαρᾶν | ἀνοίξαντα κλῇδα φρενῶν, E.*Med.*658-61; κλῇδας γάμου φυλάττει (*sc.* Hera), Ar.*Th.*976; τῶν δὲ Δίκη πολύποινος ἔχει κληῖδας ἀμοιβούς (of the gates of Night and Day), Parm.*fr.*28 B 1.14 D.K. In ἔστι κἀμοὶ κλῇς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ φύλαξ, A.*fr.*316, the implication is precisely the opposite: 'my mouth is locked,' as in: ἀκταῖς, | οὗ πότνιαι σεμνὰ τιθηνοῦνται τέλη | θνατοῖσιν, ὧν καὶ χρυσέα | κλῇς ἐπὶ γλώσσαι βέβακε | προσπόλων Εὐμολπιδᾶν, S.*OC* 1049-53; γλώσσης πικροῖς κέντροισι κληιδουχούμενοι, E.*HF* 1288. Cf. further: ψυχῆς ἀνοῖξαι τὴν κεκλῃμένην πύλην, S.*fr.*360; εἴθ' ἐξῆν ὁποῖός τις ἦν ἕκαστος | τὸ στῆθος διελόντ' ἔπειτα τὸν νοῦν | ἐσιδόντα, κλείσαντα πάλιν, | ἄνδρα φίλον νομίζειν ἀδόλῳ φρενί, *Carm.Pop.*6 D.

Thus, Hesychia is portrayed as the authority deciding whether a conflict will be settled through counsels or by war. **ὑπερτάτας** emphasizes that she is the supreme authority in this, that, whatever other factors may come into play, the decision ultimately comes down to her. Cf. νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς | θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων | ἄγει δικαιῶν τὸ βιαιότατον | ὑπερτάτᾳ χειρί, *fr.*169a.1-4. For 'height' as an image for superiority see also my note on line 77 below (p. 575).

A listening audience, who have not yet heard about the harsh side of Hesychia's personality (to be described in 8-12), will naturally take these words to refer to the idea of Hesychia deciding whether a conflict will be settled in a peaceful way or not; in other words, that, in the case of a conflict, activity on her part leads to βουλαί, and that, without her, we have πόλεμοι. That Hesychia's association with βουλαί and πόλεμοι is elaborated upon in 6/7 and 8-12 respectively in terms of two contrasting sides of her personality, and that she is said actively to effect not only peaceful but also aggressive solutions, will come as a surprise.

5. Πυθιόνικον τιμὰν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ

'Receive the honour of a Pythian victory for Aristomenes.' The honour of the present victory is dedicated to Hesychia. In the light of the common procedure of dedicating a victory either to a local tuto-

ry deity or to the patron of the games where the victory has been won (see my note on *N.*5.53/4, pp. 190-3), the dedication to Hesychia is surprizing. There is no evidence for an actual cult. The personification of 'political tranquility' may very well be a Pindaric invention. A symbolic dedication of the victory to an *ad hoc* personified moral concept would be a bold deviation from the tradition. Apparently, the poet wishes to emphasize the close connection between Aristomenes' victory and 'tranquility' in a political sense. See my interpretation (pp. 431-4, 452-4).

In passing, this line provides two of the most crucial details of the obligated information, the name of the victor and the venue where the victory has been won. The relatively early shift to the stock information[4] will make the audience expect that the invocation of Hesychia has come to an end and that a shift will be made to the epinician program in its narrowest sense; this expectancy is frustrated: τὺ γάρ in the following line elaborates upon the invocation of Hesychia, and only in line 18 the poet returns to the current victory.

The common practice of the victor's dedicating his crown to a local deity is echoed in those passages in which Pindar refers to a dedication of his own victory ode to a local deity. Cf. *N.*8.13-6 (with my note on *N.*5.53/4, pp. 190-3). Here Pindar chooses to be less specific. The victor's τιμά is dedicated to Hesychia. **τιμά** is the outward show of the victor's honour, and as such it may include both his crown and the current festive proceedings, of which Pindar's ode is a part.

For τιμά referring to the honour of an athletic victory cf. *O.*13.37, *I.*2.29, *I.*1.66, etc. Cf. also νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοις | ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου | τιμώμενος, *O.*2.43-5. For τιμά focussing upon the victor's crown specifically, cf. ἀκλεὴς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησεν ποδῶν, *O.*12.15, where the verb κατεφυλλορόησεν conjures up the idea of a crown. Cf. also ἀελλοπόδων μέν τιν' εὐφραίνοισιν ἵππων | τιμαὶ καὶ στέφανοι, *fr.*221.1/2. For the noun including Pindar's own ode, cf. οὐ γὰρ πάγος οὐδὲ προσάντης ἁ κέλευθος γίνεται, | εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἑλικωνιάδων, *I.*2.33/4; ὧν ἐγὼ | μνασθεὶς ἐπασκήσω κλυταῖς ἥρωα τιμαῖς, *N.*9.9./10; cf. also ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων (*sc.* Αἴαντα), ὃς αὐτοῦ | πᾶσαν ὀρθώσαις ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν | θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν. | τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει, | εἴ τις εὖ εἴπηι τι· καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν | ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεί. | προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν, κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων | καὶ Μελίσσωι, παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ' ἐπάξιον, | ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα, *I.*4.37-45; cf. also Pindar's *ad hoc* definition of τιμά in τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται | ὧν θεὸς ἁβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων, *N.*7.31/2.

---

[4] Cf. the proem of *N.*5, contrast *N.*3; see my note on 'Αριστοκλείδας, *N.*3.15, pp. 271/2, and my basic remarks on raising expectancies in the introduction, pp. 41-5.

For the deity kindly 'receiving' the dedication cf. *O.*6.98, *O.*5.2/3, *P.*12.4/5, *P.*9.73, B.11.15-7, quoted in my note on φιλόφρων in line 1 above (p. 468). For the idea of 'receiving the κῶμος,' possibly hinted at here, see further my note on lines 19/20 below (pp. 500-2). For the dative with **δέκομαι**, cf. *O.*13.29, *P.*12.5/6, *I.*6.4, *fr.*133.2. Cf. also Σ. *ad h.l.*: ἀντὶ τοῦ παρὰ 'Αριcτομένουc δέχου (5, II 207 Dr.); Σ. *ad O.*13.29: δέξαι δέ οἱ, ἀντὶ τοῦ δέξαι παρὰ αὐτοῦ (39b, I 365 Dr.). "Il dativo, col quale è indicata la persona da cui ci riceve qualcosa ..., esprime propriamente l'interesse che la persona ha rispetto all'atto dell'accogliere," Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 564). See further Kühner-Gerth, II i, p. 419.

5-13

For you know how to act mildly, and, likewise, how to be acted mildly upon, with an exact feeling for what is expedient in the circumstances. You, whenever someone plunges implacable rancour into his and your heart, oppose harshly the force of enemies and clap Hybris in the bilge. Porphyrion did not understand that he roused her to fight (by acting) in defiance of his share.

5-7. τὺ γὰρ τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξειν τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶc | ἐπίcταcαι

'For you know how to act mildly and, likewise, how to be acted mildly upon,' in other words: 'For, just as you know how to effect mildness, you know how to receive it.' The phrase is to be understood in the light of the seldom questioned basic assumption in Greek thought that there is a causal relation between what one does and what one suffers.

Cf. εὖ δρῶcαν, εὖ πάcχουcαν, A.*Eu.*868; τοίγαρ κακῶc δράcαντεc οὐκ ἐλάccονα | πάcχουcι, A.*Pers.*813/4; δράcαντα παθεῖν, | τριγέρων μῦθοc τάδε φωνεῖ, A.*Ch.*313/4; μίμνει δὲ μίμνοντοc ἐν θρόνωι Διὸc | παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα, A.*Ag.*1563/4; ὅcτιc δὲ δράcειν μὲν οἴεται τοὺc πέλαc κακῶc, πείcεcθαι δ' οὔ, οὐ cωφρονεῖ, Antiphon *fr.*58 Diels. The causality between δρᾶν (or ἔρδειν or ῥέζειν) and πάcχειν is sometimes made explicit by means of καί: τὸν δρῶντα γάρ τι καὶ παθεῖν ὀφείλεται, S.*fr.*229 (Jebb/Pearson); εἰ δεῖν' ἔδραcαc, δεινὰ καὶ παθεῖν cε δεῖ, S.*fr.*962 (Jebb/Pearson); δράcαντι γάρ τοι καὶ παθεῖν ὀφείλεται, A.*fr.*456; μὴ πλείω κακὰ | πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρῶcιν ἐκδίκωc ἐμέ, S.*Ant.*927/8. This is also the case for the other Pindaric example: ῥέζοντά τι καὶ παθεῖν ἔοικεν, *N.*4.32. Aristotle does not agree: δοκεῖ δέ τιcι καὶ τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸc εἶναι ἁπλῶc δίκαιον, ὥcπερ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἔφαcαν· ὡρίζοντο γὰρ ἁπλῶc τὸ δίκαιον τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸc ἄλλωι. τὸ δ' ἀντιπεπονθὸc οὐκ ἐφαρμόττει οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ διανεμητικὸν δίκαιον οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ διορθωτικόν, καίτοι βούλονταί γε τοῦτο λέγειν καὶ τὸ 'Ραδαμάνθυοc δίκαιον· εἴ κε πάθοι τά τ' ἔρεξε, δίκη κ' ἰθεῖα γένοιτο, Arist.*E.N.*1132^{b}21-7. Cf. also more elaborate variations upon the principle, such as 'Ιφιγένειαν ἀνάξια δράcαc | ἄξια πάcχων, A.*Ag.*1527/8, 'suffering what he deserves, having done to Iphigenia what she did not deserve' (Denniston & Page *ad loc.*). See also R. Hirzel, *Talio (Philologus Suppl.* 11), 1907, 405-82.

Thus Hesychia knows how to do τὸ μαλθακόν, as she knows how to receive it,[5] and *vice versa*. In the light of the following portrayal of Hesychia's tough side, her being 'harsh' (τραχεῖα, 10) against her enemies whenever they confront her with unrelenting grudge, lines 6/7 are perfectly understandable as referring to a 'soft,' i.e., 'mild' response on Hesychia's part whenever she herself is mildly acted upon. Thus 6/7 form the exact mirror image of 8-12, to the extent that the two passages describe the two contrasting reactions of Hesychia, both in keeping with the same principle, *viz.* that one is treated in the same fashion as one treats her.

For **μαλθακός** referring to a 'mild' attitude, i.e., an attitude such as is contrasted by 'harshness' and 'unrelenting grudge,' cf., e.g., cὺ μαλακίζου, τὴν δ' ἐμὴν αὐθαδίαν | ὀργῆς τε τραχύτητα μὴ 'πίπληccέ μοι, A.*Pr.*79/80; οὐ γάρ ποτ' Ἄργουc γαῖαν ἐc τὸ μαλθακὸν | προcηγόμεcθα, E.*Or.*714/5. For μαλακόc referring to a 'mild' political climate, cf. τὸ δ' εὐβουλίαι τε καὶ α[ἰδ]οῖ | ἐγκείμενο[ν] αἰεὶ θάλλει μαλακαῖc ε[ὐ]δίαι[c, *Pae.*2.50-2; cf. also ἐccὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατοc, Παιάν τέ coι τιμᾶι φάοc. | χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προcβάλλοντα τρώμαν ἕλκεοc ἀμφιπολεῖν. | ῥάιδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν cεῖcαι καὶ ἀφαυροτέροιc· | ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώραc αὖτιc ἕccαι δυcπαλὲc δὴ γίνται, *P.*4.270-3, where Arcesilaus is compared to a physician who is capable of healing the sick state.

For μαλθακόc having connotations like 'not persevering,' and so (since this is the wrong attitude for a warrior or an athlete) 'weak,' see my note on μαλαχθείc *N.*3.16, p. 274. Cf. also the reaction of the Greeks on seeing Hector's body: ὢ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ μαλακώτεροc ἀμφαφάαcθαι | Ἕκτωρ ἢ ὅτε νῆαc ἐνέπρηcεν πυρὶ κηλέωι, *Il.*22.373/4.

The problem, however, is **γάρ**. Although the function of 6/7 in the light of what follows is evident, the connection with the preceding context is not so clear. γάρ marks 6/7 as an explanation of the preceding entreaty to Hesychia to receive the honour of Aristomenes' victory.[6] How does the assertion that she knows how to act mildly and, likewise, how to be acted mildly upon, fulfill this function? The answer to this question resides in the connotations of τὸ μαλθακόν.

Pindar frequently uses the adjectives μαλακόc and **μαλθακόc** as a qualification of anything which is part of the victory-celebration, especially of song and voice.[7]

---

[5] For πάcχω with an object referring to something pleasant, cf., e.g., παθὼν ἐcλόν, *P.*9.89; παθόντεc πού τι φιλόξεινον ἔργον, *I.*2.24; ἁβρὰ πάcχειν, *fr.*2.1.

[6] Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 564) says that γάρ introduces the justification of Hesychia's ambivalence. The point is, however, that a listening audience have, at this point in the poem, heard nothing yet about any ambivalence in Hesychia's character.

[7] The 'gentle words' are, of course, well known as a Homeric formula, cf. *Il.*1.582, 4.256, 6.214, 337, 343, 9.113, 10.288, 542, 11.137, 12.267, 17.431, 21.339, *Od.*1.56, 6.143, 146, 148, 9.363, 493, 10.70, 173, 422, 547, 11.552, 12.207,

Cf. νεοθαλὴς δ' αὔξεται | μαλθακᾷ νικαφορία σὺν ἀοιδᾷ, *N.*9.48/9; μαλακαῖς ἐπαοιδαῖς, *P.*3.51; μαλακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί, *I.*2.8; τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὖτε φρενὸς εὐκλέας ὀϊστοὺς ἱέντες; *O.*2.89/90; εἰμὶ δ' ἄσχολος ἀναθέμεν | πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν | λύραι τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῷι, lines 29-31 below; μεγάλαν δ' ἀρετὰν | δρόσωι μαλθακᾷι | ῥανθεῖσαν κώμων θ' ὑπὸ χεύμασιν, *P.*5.98-100, where the qualification μαλθακᾷι suffices as a signal for δρόσωι being a metaphor for song; cf. also *P.*1.98.

The association of τὸ μαλθακόν with victory celebrations resides in the remedial powers of celebration: ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων | ἰατρός· αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ | Μοισᾶν θύγατρες ἀοιδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἁπτόμεναι. | οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει | γυῖα, τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος, *N.*4.1-5. After the hardship of the contest the feast is, so to speak, the doctor healing the victor's injuries with soft hands (cf. also 'Ασκλαπιόν, | τὸν φαρμάκων δίδαξε μαλακόχειρα νόμον, *N.*3.54/5, and καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν | ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν ἐν βαθυπεδίωι Νεμέαι τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει, *N.*3.17/8, with my note *ad loc.*, pp. 276-8; cf. also *N.*8.48-50).[8]

Πυθιόνικον τιμάν in the preceding line includes the present ode, and this evokes the 'poetic' connotations of τὸ μαλθακόν. This gives γάρ its full force. In the context of the preceding entreaty to Hesychia to accept Aristomenes' Πυθιόνικον τιμάν, the obvious characteristic of Hesychia, that she knows to do τὸ μαλθακόν, is used as an argument proving that she is also fit to receive τὸ μαλθακόν, viz. this ode, which is a concrete representation of Aristomenes' Πυθιόνικος τιμά. In other words, in the political context τὸ μαλθακὸν παθεῖν is the condion for Hesychia to ἔρξαι τὸ μαλθακόν: she acts mildly when she is mildly acted upon, which contrasts the situation mentioned in 8-12: if someone violates her principles by endulging in unrelenting grudge, she will show the tough side of her personality. As a motivation of the preceding entreaty the principle of the natural correlation between ἔρξαι and παθεῖν works the other way around: Hesychia's capability of ἔρξαι τὸ μαλθακόν is a reason to assume that she is, likewise, capable of τὸ μαλθακὸν παθεῖν, i.e., that she is the right person the receive this ode.

15.374, 16.279, 18.283, 19.5, 415, 20.165, 21.192, 24.393, *h.Cer.*336. Cf. also Hes.*Th.*84, 90; Sem.7.18 W., Sol.27.15 W., A.*Ag.*95.

[8] On the remedial powers of song and festivity, see P. Laín Entralgo, *The Therapy of the Word in Classical Antiquity*, tr. L.J. Rather & J.M. Sharp, New Haven 1970; A.L.T. Bergren, 'Helen's Good Drug: *Odyssey* IV.1-305', *Contemporary Litery Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts* (ed. S. Krésic), Ottawa 1981, 205-210; G.A. Machemer, 'Medicine, Music, and Magic: The Healing Grace of Pindar's *Fourth Nemean*', *HSCPh* 95, 1993, 113-141. For a more general account of the opposition μαλθακός *vs.* τραχύς, see T.K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind*, pp. 71-98.

Pindar' exploitation of both the denotation and the 'poetic' connotations of μαλακός is paralleled by the closing lines of *N.*4: οἷον αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι, | ῥήματα πλέκων, ἀπάλαιστος ἐν λόγωι ἕλκειν, | μαλακὰ μὲν φρονέων ἐσλοῖς, | τραχὺς δὲ παλιγκότοις ἔφεδρος, *N.*4.95/6. In this passage, the activities of the person who praises the wrestling trainer Melesias (αἰνέων Μελησίαν) are described in terms borrowed from wrestling (ἔριδα στρέφοι, πλέκων, ἀπάλαιστος, ἕλκειν).[9] in 95/6, "with considerable ingenuity Pindar combines praise of Melesias with implications about his own practice as a poet, for he is αἰνέων Μελησίαν, 93. The trainer shows his ability in the different way he handles pupils; Pindar also favours the good (*N.*3.29, *I.*3.7), but is uncompromising towards the ill-intentioned (39)" (Willcock *ad loc.*, p. 109). The phrase μαλακὰ μὲν φρονέων ἐσλοῖς thus applies both to the *laudator* and to the *laudandus*,[10] because the *laudator* describes his own activities in termilogy taken from the *laudandus'* activities, which he is praising. On the level of the activities of the *laudator*, μαλακὰ φρονέων ἐσλοῖς refers to praising the good in song. The image interacts with the imagery in the opening lines of the poem (cited above); cf. Bury, *Nemean Odes*, pp. 232-4 (Appendix A, note 5): "The hymn, which is to soothe Timasarchus after his labours (vs. 4) is an instance of μαλακὰ φρονεῖν ἐσλοῖς (vs. 95)."

The economy of expression is noteworthy. Lines 6/5 both motivate the preceding entreaty to Hesychia to accept Aristomenes' Πυθιόνικος τιμά, and describe one of the two aspects of Hesychia's personality. Moreover they refer to the condition for her to 'act mildly': she will do so whenever she is mildly acted upon. This prepares for the contrasting situation and attitude described in lines 8-12.

For **ἐπίσταμαι** with an infinitive, 'know how to,' cf. *O.*6.26, *P.*3.80.

7. καιρῶι σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ

The two contrasting ways in which Hesychia behaves (6/7, 8-12), subject to the two contrasting conditions, account for καιρῶι σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ: Hesychia knows to choose exactly the right, i.e., most expedient, behaviour in given circumstances. καιρός denotes the opportune, the expedient, referring to what is exactly the right behaviour in relation to the circumstances. ὁπόταν in the next line retrospectively evokes the temporal connotations of καιρός.[11] For more details on the noun see the appendix (pp. 647-53).

It is worth observing that for the audience of the ode καιρῶι σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ comes as a surprising limitation to τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶς | ἐπίστασαι. The association of Hesychia with τὸ μαλθα-

---

[9] Thus Σ. *N.*4.153 (III 87 Dr.): ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιόντων δὲ πάλιν ἡ μεταφορά, καὶ τροπικαὶ αἱ λέξεις ἀπὸ τῆς ἀθλήσεως. "In ingenious language he avers that the person finding words to praise Melesias (i.e. Pindar or another) would metaphorically have to take on the skills of the wrestling trainer himself" (Willcock *ad loc.*, p. 108).

[10] The same is true for τραχύς, cf. *Pae.*2.32 and *N.*7.76 respectively.

[11] Thus Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 565).

κόν would have been quite obvious and unquestionable for Pindar's audience, if only because of their familiarity with the noun ἡcυχία. The addition that she effects τὸ μαλθακόν in keeping with an exact feeling for when such a behaviour is opportune, would in the first instance have puzzled them, as it implies that, apparently, Hesychia does not always effect τὸ μαλθακόν. The antistrophe then proves that this in fact the case and that Hesychia has an aggressive side too. It is only after this tough side of hers has been elaborated upon that the audience are in a position to fully understand the implications of καιρῶι cὺν ἀτρεκεῖ.

The qualification **ἀτρεκής** gives a slightly redundant impression, as exactitude seems inherent to the concept καιρόc. Pindar's motivation for emphasizing preciseness in this context is probably twofold. First, Hesychia may behave in two contrasting ways, subject to two contrasting conditions; moreover, the conditions and Hesychia's reactions are directly related: mild behaviour causes her to be mild, aggression provokes aggression on her side. The symmetry of this system does in fact qualify for being described as in keeping with *exact* καιρόc. Second, more down to earth, the adjective has the effect of emphasizing καιρόc. This is functional because the limitation comes as a surprise.

For **cύν** with an abstract notion cf. cὺν δίκαι, *P.*9.96, *N.*9.44; cὺν τύχαι, *I.*8.67; cὺν ἀνάγκαι, *P.*1.51, *fr.*122.9. For cύν in a temporal sense cf. *P.*4.70, *P.*11.10, *N.*2.24, *N.*9.44, *fr.*123.1.

Antistrophe A

8-12

Lines 8-12 elaborate upon Hesychia's harsh side. If someone violates her principles, she will be τραχεῖα, facing the strength of her enemies, and cancel out ὕβριc. Porphyrion and Typhos in lines 12-8 function as examples illustrating that *hybris* will be punished. That Hesychia's association with βουλαί and πόλεμοι is elaborated upon in 6/7 and 8-12 respectively in terms of two contrasting sides of her personality, and that she is said actively to effect not only peaceful but also aggressive solutions, will have come as a surprise to Pindar's audience. The idea of 'tranquility' making war upon her enemies is in fact paradoxical. For Pindar's manipulations of expectancies on the part of his audience see introduction pp. 41-5.

The two-sidedness of Hesychia ties in with quite a few similar portrayals of two-sidedness in this ode: the two constrasting moods of Apollo, implied in this juxtaposition of his killing Porphyrion and his

kindly receiving the victor and his revel (18), Alcmaeon's martial and friendly side (45-7, 56-60), the δαίμων's two-sidedness (76-8). See further my interpretation (pp. 448, 453).

•*Mood:* After the calm opening lines, describing Hesychia's gentle side, in line 8 the mood changes suddenly. We are presented a fierce and aggressive side of the deity, unrelentingly punishing her enemies. The collocation in 8-12 of several strong, emotionally charged words that conjure up aggression (ἀμείλιχον καρδίαι κότον ἐνελάϲηι, τραχεῖα, δυϲμενέων, κράτει, τιθεῖϲ ... ἐν ἄντλωι, ἐξερεθίζων) underscores the emotive effect of the change of mood. The description of Hesychia's tough side leads over into references to Porphyrion and Typhos, scaring monsters who were once a threat to the world order. The reference to their being killed by Zeus and Apollo (17/8) brings the grim atmosphere to a climax. Then this same Apollo serves as the hinge of a sudden shift of mood to the joy of the victory and the current festive occasion.

Many commentators[12] point out similarities between this bipartite description of Hesychia and the opening lines of *N.*8, where Hora is said to be either mild or not, according to whether she inspires noble or base desires, and the proem of *P.*1, where the soothening effects of the the Muses and Apollo singing (1-12) constrast sharply to the disquiting effect it has upon ὅϲϲα δὲ μὴ πεφίληκε Ζεύϲ (13). Especially the latter passage is illustrative for Pindar's interest in effecting an emotive impact by means creating sudden shifts of mood. See further introduction pp. 45-7.

• *Word Order:* The word order in 8-12 is characterized by a high degree of (syntactical) tension. τὺ δέ, effecting a 'false' *topic shift*, emphasizing the antithesis residing in the two *comments* (see below), projects Hesychia as the *topic* and the grammatical subject of the sentence. This pronoun is then followed by a subordinate clause with a different subject (ὁπόταν τιϲ ἀμείλιχον | καρδίαι κότον ἐνελάϲηι, 8/9), which postpones the main clause of which τύ is the subject. Word order within the ὁπόταν clause itself, too, is constitutive of suspense: only with κότον, ἀμείλιχον falls into place; the clause is syntactically complete only with ἐνελάϲηι. τραχεῖα in 10 then congruing with τύ, resumes the subject of the main clause. δυϲμενέων cannot be construed yet; ὑπαντιάξαιϲα keeps δυϲμενέων hanging in the air; only with κράτει we have a syntactically complete participle clause. Then, with τιθεῖϲ | ὕβριν ἐν ἄντλωι, 11/2, we finally get the main clause of which τύ in 8 is a part. Only then the sentence as a whole is syntactically complete.

---

[12] Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 552; Giannini on lines 3/4 (in Gentili, *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 564); cf. also Krischer, *WS* 19, 1985, 115-124.

8. τὺ δέ

Referring to a person in the marked position before δέ is a very common means of signaling *topic shift.* A sentence initial personal pronoun, especially in the nominative, followed by δέ as a rule coincides with a *topic shift* from one story participant to another (already mentioned before): so-called *switch-reference.*

Cf., e.g., ἐμοὶ μέν ... τὺ δέ, *O.*1.84-5; for τὺ δέ with discontinuity of *topic* cf. further *P.*2.57, *N.*5.41, *I.*7.31, line 61 below. Switch reference is not confined to pronouns in the nominative: cf. cὲ δ', *P.*2.18; τοῖο δ', *N.*5.32, with my note (p. 155). See Bakker, *Studies in Language* 17, 1993, 275-311, esp. 282-4; Sicking, *Two Studies*, p. 13. See also my *CPh* 89, 1994, 314.

Here, surprisingly, τὺ δέ coincides with continuity of both grammatical subject and *topic:* the same pronoun referring to the same *topic* has preceded two lines earlier. The effect of this 'false' *topic shift* is clear: the illusion is created that the aggressive component of Hesychia's personality differs from the soft side of her character to such an extent, that one may, so to speak, get the idea of her consisting in two different persons;[13] in other words, the 'false' *topic shift* here is a means of emphasizing the antithesis residing in the two *comments.*

The technique of highlighting an antithesis in *comments* by means of a 'false' *topic shift* is used also in: [χο]ροcτάcιc, Ι ϝείποιμί κ', [ἐ]γὼν μὲν αὐτὰ Ι παρcένοc μάταν ἀπὸ θράνω λέλακα Ι γλαύξ· ἐγὼ[ν] δὲ τᾶι μὲν 'Αώτι μάλιcτα Ι ϝανδάνην ἐρῶ, Alcm.*fr.*1.84-8, which can be paraphrased as 'I am only a poor singer (in vain I howl like an owl from the roof-beam), but such as I am I wish most to please Aotis' (thus Campbell *ad loc.*, pp. 209/10). The effect is emphasis upon the antithesis in the two *comments.* The desire to please the Dawn goddess is irreconcilable with the lack of skill to do so; yet, here the two are combined in one and the same person nonetheless. Cf. also μέτρα μὲν γνώμαι διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων, *I.*6.71. For the anaphora cf. also πολλὰ μέν ... πολλὰ δέ, *O.*13.14-7, *P.*9.123-5, *N.*11.6-7; εὖ μὲν ... εὖ δ', *N.*11.3-4; ὅccουc μὲν ... ὅccουc δέ, *N.*1.62-3; τρὶc μὲν ... τρὶc δέ, *N.*10.27-8; ἥμιcυ μέν ... ἥμιcυ δ', *N.*10.87-8. Anaphora of the verb: *I.*8.16, *I.*7.32, B.3.15/6. See also Bowra, *Pindar*, pp. 206/7; Denniston, p. 370.

8-9. ὁπόταν τιc ἀμείλιχον Ι καρδίαι κότον ἐνελάcῃι

'Whenever someone drives unrelenting grudge into the heart.' Whose καρδία is this, Hesychia's or of the τιc? Most modern critics take τιc as the implied owner of the heart: 'whenever someone drives

---

[13] I would strongly advise against the notion 'schizophrenic δέ' being incorporated into the philologist's analytical armamentarium.

unrelenting anger into his (own) heart.'[14] Then the expression is a strong variation on more common expressions like: κότον ἔνθετο θυμῶι, *Od.*11.102; ἐμὴν χάριν ἔνθεο θυμῶι, Thgn.1321.[15] Although this interpretation gives excellent sense in the context, it can be challenged on the basis of the pragmatic structure of the sentence as a whole and on the basis of the connotations of ἐνελαύνω.

If a possessive pronoun is lacking, the implied owner is as a rule identical to the subject of the sentence. Here the subject of the main sentence (τύ, i.e., Hesychia) differs from the subject (τις) of the ὁπόταν clause in which καρδίαι occurs. The most natural interpretation is to identify the owner of the καρδία with the subject of the clause in which it occurs, so with τις. Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 328) emphatically advocates this interpretation: "that is the only natural construction of the Greek. ... If Ἡσυχία were meant, we should expect τεᾶι." It should, however, be observed that here the situation is slightly more ambiguous than with comparable implicit owners in subclauses with a different subject in the main clause, due to the fact that here the subject of the main clause is by means of a theme construction involving left dislocation firmly pre-stated as the *topic* of the sentence as a whole. It is not unthinkable that this pragmatic predominance of the subject of the main clause overrules the τις as a candidate for being taken as the owner of the heart.

The connotations of **ἐνελαύνω** cause further ambiguities. According to Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 328), "the figure is that of a nail."[16] The image of someone hammering grudge like a nail into his own heart certainly has a poetic appeal; unfortunately, there is no evidence for Gildersleeve's suggestion. The verb (ἐν)ελαύνω is not the technical term for hammering nails.[17] There is nothing in the context that conjures up this image. The combination of ἐλαύνω with ἐν is quite frequently used in contexts describing battle scenes, in the sense of 'driving, plunging' a weapon into the body of one's opponent.

---

[14] Thus Σ. *ad h.l.* (ἐνθῆι τῆι ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαι, 10a, II 207 Dr.); Dissen *ad loc.* (p. 284); Mezger *ad loc.* (p. 402); Christ *ad loc.* (p. 195); Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 328); Farnell (I, p. 126); Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 157; Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 208). Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 238) identifies Hesychia as the owner of the heart. Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 211, paraphrases 'whenever someone fixes unsweet anger into her heart'; her 'working translation' on p. 219, however, gives 'his heart.'

[15] Thus also Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 565).

[16] Thus also Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 300).

[17] The verb δέω is often used of nails (e.g., τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος δῆσεν ἅλοις, *P.*4.71; Pl.*Phd.*83d). The technical term for 'hammering' nails is ἐγκρούω (e.g., Thphr.*Char.*4.13).

Cf. ἐφορμαθεὶϲ δ' ἄρ' ἄκοντι θοῶι | ἤλαϲε Λυγκέοϲ ἐν πλευραῖϲι χαλκόν, *N.*10.70; ἦ ῥα καὶ ἐν δεινῶι ϲάκει ἤλαϲεν ὄβριμον ἔγχοϲ, *Il.*20.259; ἡ δ' οὐκ ἔγχοϲ ἔρυτο, διὰ πρὸ δὲ εἴϲατο χαλκόϲ, | νειαίρηι δ' ἐν γαϲτρὶ διὰ ζωϲτῆροϲ ἔλαϲϲε, *Il.*5.538/9, 17.518/9; ϲὺν δ' ἕλκεα πάντα μέμυκεν | ὅϲϲ' ἐτύπη· πολέεϲ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῶι χαλκὸν ἔλαϲϲαν, *Il.*24.420/1. Cf. also: πρώτωι γὰρ ϲτρεφθέντι μεταφρένωι ἐν δόρυ πῆξεν | ὤμων μεϲϲηγύϲ, διὰ δὲ ϲτῆθεϲφιν ἔλαϲϲε, *Il.*5.40/1, 8.258/9, 11.447/8; οὐ μέν μοι φεύγοντι μεταφρένωι ἐν δόρυ πήξειϲ, | ἀλλ' ἰθὺϲ μεμαῶτι διὰ ϲτήθεϲφιν ἔλαϲϲον, *Il.*22.283/4; διὰ πρὸ δὲ χαλκὸν ἔλαϲϲεν, *Il.*15.342; ἵνα κρεῶν νιν ὕπερ μάχαϲ ἔλαϲεν ἀντιτυχόντ' ἀνὴρ μαχαίραι, *N.*7.42; νῶτον ὄπιϲθ' αἰχμῆι δουρὸϲ ἐληλάλμενοϲ, Tyrt.11.20 W., etc.

This common usage (constitutive of the 'collocative meaning' of the verb) makes it quite possible that the audience thought of a battle scene here.[18] Connotations of war are clearly present in the following lines (see my note on δυϲμενέων). Moreover, the description of Hesychia's harsh side is an elaboration of πολέμων in 3.

With these connotations the identification of τιϲ as the owner of the heart is problematic. The τιϲ plunges ἀμείλιχοϲ κότοϲ, as if it were a weapon, into a heart; driving a weapon into one's own heart is not the usual practice on a battle field. In other words, the specific martial connotations of ἐνελάϲηι guide the hearer to identifying Hesychia, the opponent of this unspecified τιϲ, as the owner of the heart.

It is instructive to compare: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ταῦτα νόον | ἰαίνει φθονερῶν· ϲτάθμαϲ δέ τινεϲ ἑλκόμενοι | περιϲϲᾶϲ ἐνέπαξαν ἕλκοϲ ὀδυναρὸν ἑᾶι πρόϲθε καρδίαι, | πρὶν ὅϲα φροντίδι μητίονται τυχεῖν, *P.*2.89-92, where the possessive pronoun ἑᾶι disambiguates what is left implicit here:[19] the envious deliver wounds to their *own* hearts. Despite the fact that the owner of the καρδία is identical to the subject of the sentence, a situation in which a possessive pronoun is as a rule redundant, Pindar deemed it necessary to add an explicit signal for this identification, because the action of afflicting a wound is in normal circumstances executed to someone else. The omission of ἑᾶι would result in ambiguity. Then the door would be open to an interpretation that the wound is being delivered to the person who is the object of their envy.

Diathesis is another means of disambiguating in contexts like this. Cf. ὄφρα ... ἐγχεϲφόροιϲ ἐπιμείξαιϲ | Αἰθιόπεϲϲι χεῖραϲ, ἐν φραϲὶ πάξαιθ', ὅπωϲ ϲφίϲι μὴ κοίρανοϲ ὀπίϲω | πάλιν οἴκαδ' ἀνεψιὸϲ ζαμενὴϲ Ἑλένοιο Μέμνων μόλοι, *N.*3.59-63: 'He (Achilles) should fix it in his heart that their king Memnon would not come home'. The dependent ὅπωϲ clause (62/3) formulates a firm determination on Achilles' part. Although the combi-

---

[18] Thus Dissen *ad loc.* (p. 284); Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 70).

[19] Therefore *P.*2.89-92 cannot be used as proof for identification of the τιϲ and the owner of the καρδία here. Cf. Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 208.

nation of ἐν φρεcί and πήγνυμι is reminiscent of Homeric passages where someone fixes a weapon in the φρενέc of his opponent, the diathesis of πάξαιθ' excludes the possibility of taking φραcί to refer to the φρενέc of the Ethiopians. The middle indicates that the φρένεc are Achilles' own φρένεc. Moreover, as a contrast to ἀμείλιχον κότον in our passage, the object of πάξαιθ' in *N*.3.62, viz. the ὅπωc clause, does not qualify as a notion for which a weapon could be an image. The connotations of Homeric battle scenes that are evoked, are functional only on a superficial level: they help to conjure up Achilles' exploits before Troy, giving this passage an 'authentic' flavour. See further my notes *ad loc.*, pp. 363-6.

In sum, the syntax guides the hearer to identifying τιc as the owner of the heart, although the pragmatic structure of the sentence seems to allow also of taking the heart to be Hesychia's. The connotations of ἐνελάcηι, on the other hand, steer the hearer to dissociating the unspecified τιc from the owner of the heart and take it to be Hesychia's.

It is not easy to make a choice here. One gets the impression that Pindar carefully composed this sentence in order to be susceptible of both interpretations. The ambiguity is functional. In the description of the two sides of Hesychia it is emphasized that she acts exactly like she is being acted upon: mild behaviour causes her to be mild, aggression provokes aggression on her side. Thus, in keeping with this system, someone who drives anger into his own heart inevitably drives anger into Hesychia's heart as well. The two interpretations merge; it is this double relevance that gives the sentence its full poignancy. The ambiguity of this sentence underscores the principle of Hesychia behaving exactly like one behaves towards her. Whereas, in the description of Hesychia's mild side, τὸ μαλθακὸν ἔρξαι τε καὶ παθεῖν ὁμῶc spells out this principle, the exact correspondence between ἔρξαι and παθεῖν is here compellingly illustrated by means of one sentence describing both at the same time, so as to visualize arrestingly that the two form an unresolvable unity.

• *Semantics:* The noun **κότοc** occurs only here in Pindar. It denotes 'grudge, rancour.' It is a rather strong term; κότοc is more inveterate and less easily appeased than χόλοc (cf. LSJ *s.v.*).[20]

Cf. εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψηι, | ἀλλά τε καὶ μετόπιcθεν ἔχει κότον, ὄφρα τελέccηι, | ἐν cτήθεccιν ἑοῖcιν, *Il.*1.81-3; δὴ γάρ οἱ ἔχεν κότον ἐμμενὲc αἰεί, *Il.*13.517. In τίφθ' οὕτω τετίηcθον, Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη; | οὐ μέν θην κάμετόν γε μάχηι ἔνι κυδιανείρηι | ὀλλῦcαι Τρῶαc, τοῖcιν κότον αἰνὸν ἔθεcθε, *Il.*8.447-9, it refers to Hera's and Athene's rancour towards the Trojans. Similarly, in *Od.*11.102, 13.342, it refers to Poseidon's rancour towards Odysseus. The noun is frequent in Aeschylus. He uses it almost

[20] Thus also Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 565).

exclusively to refer to divine wrath (*Supp.*347, 385, *Ag.*1211, *Eu.*900, etc.). In τὸ κοινόν τις ἀστῶν ἐν εὐδίαι | τιθεὶς ἐρευνασάτω μεγαλάνορος Ἡσυχίας τὸ φαιδρὸν φάος, | στάσιν ἀπὸ πραπίδος ἐπίκοτον ἀνελών, | πενίας δότειραν, ἐχθρὰν κουροτρόφον, *fr.*109, ἐπίκοτος qualifies στάσις, which is opposed to Hesychia. Cf. also μαλακὰ μὲν φρονέων ἐσλοῖς, | τραχὺς δὲ παλιγκότοις ἔφεδρος, *N.*4.95/6, where παλίγκοτος is used to characterize the laudator's adversaries in a passages which shares the μαλακός/τραχύς antithesis with *h.l.* Cf. further ἄκοτος, *Pae.*1.3; κοτέω, *fr.*140a.57.

The qualification **ἀμείλιχος** underscores the connotations of inplacability of κότος. ἀμείλιχος characterizes the attitude of someone who is insensitive to μειλίχια ἔπεα.

Cf. Ἀΐδης τοι ἀμείλιχος ἠδ' ἀδαμάστος, *Il.*9.158, 'Hades yeilds neither to prayer nor to violence' (Leaf *ad loc.*); ὣς τώ γε κλαίνοτε προσαυδήτην βασιλῆα | μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν· ἀμείλικτον δ' ὄπ' ἄκουσαν, *Il.*11.136/7, where Agamemnon does not yield to Pisander and Hippolochus imploring him to spare their lives; Ἐρινὺς ἀμείλιχον ἦτορ ἔχουσα, *Il.*9.572, etc. The adjective occurs once more in Pindar: (ὕμνων θησαυρός) τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ἐλθὼν ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας | στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχοὺς ἁλὸς ἄξοισι παμφόρωι χεράδει | τυπτόμενον, *P.*6.11-14, where ἀμείλιχος is in keeping with the terminology of the *vehicle*, conjuring up an unrelenting army. Sol.*fr.*32.2 W. has βίη ἀμείλιχος in an explicitly political context.

For the political implications of this 'implacable rancour,' see interpretation, pp. 433/4.

10-11. τραχεῖα δυσμενέων | ὑπαντιάξαισα κράτει

'Harshly facing the force of enemies.' Those who act upon their unrelenting grudge become δυσμενεῖς, enemies of eachother and, in that they violate Hesychia's principles, also her enemies. The qualification of Hesychia as **τραχεῖα**, 'harsh, uncompromising, relentless,' betokens the shift in her mood from mild behaviour to its opposite, unrelenting aggression. Characteristic for someone who is τραχύς, is that nothing will make him relent and do τὸ μαλθακόν.

The adjective τραχύς, when qualifying matter, denotes 'rough,' as opposed to 'smooth' (X.*Eq.*9.9; Thphr.*Sens.*65, *Il.*5.308, *O.*8.55, A.*Pr.*726; cf. also *P.*1.10, where it qualifies points of spears, which are 'not smooth' by understatement; cf. also *fr.*111.3, where it qualifies Heracles' club). It is used metaphorically for 'unpleasant, harsh, bitter' (*P.*4.140 of a symbolic 'bad hangover,' *I.*4.17, *fr.*205.3). When qualifying persons, τραχύς means 'harsh, hard-hearted,' with the connotations 'relentless' and 'uncompromising,' sometimes 'callous.' Cf. εἰ δέ τις ἀρκέων φίλοις | ἐχθροῖσι τραχὺς ὑπαντιάζει, *Pae.*2.31/2; Διὸς γὰρ δυσπάραιτοι φρένες, | ἅπας δὲ τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῆι, A.*Pr.*34/5; τραχὺς μόναρχος οὐδ' ὑπεύθυνος κρατεῖ, A.*Pr.*324; cf. also νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεὶς | ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχύς εἰμι καταθέμεν, *N.*7.75/6. For the opposition with μαλθακός, cf. *N.*4.95/6, cited in the preceding note; οἶδ' ὅτι τραχὺς καὶ παρ' ἑαυτῶι | τὸ δίκαιον

ἔχων· ἔμπας δ', οἴω, | μαλακογνώμων | ἔσται ποθ', ὅταν ταύτηι ῥαισθῆι, A.*Pr.*186-9. For the μαλακός/τραχύς antithesis see further Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind*, pp. 71-98.

In early authors **δυσμενής** has a strong affinity with war-related contexts, referring to an enemy whom one faces, has faced or might face on the battle-field. Here the reference to those who let their grudge escalate to armed conflict, and thus become eachother's and Hesychia's opponents, as δυσμενεῖς is in keeping with the martial terminology used to describe the harsh side of her personality (cf. my note on ἐνελάσηι above). The imagery interacts with reality. Because animosity towards Hesychia implies a threat to tranquility within a πόλις, leading to στάσις or war, the connotations of battle scenes evoked in these lines visualize what in fact will happen in reality when Hesychia's principles are violated.

Cf. Χρομίωι κεν ὑπασπίζων παρὰ πεζοβόαις ἵπποις τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαις | ἔκρινας, ἂν κίνδυνον ὀξείας ἀυτᾶς, | οὕνεκεν ἐν πολέμωι κείνα θεὸς ἔντυεν αὐτοῦ | θυμὸν αἰχματὰν ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν Ἐνυαλίου. παῦροι δὲ βουλεῦσαι φόνου | παρποδίοι νεφέλαν τρέχαι ποτὶ δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν στίχας | χερσὶ καὶ ψυχᾶι δυνατοί· λέγεται μὰν Ἕκτορι κτλ., *N.*9.34-9; κείνοις δ' ὑπέρτατον ἦλθε φέγγος | ἄντα δ[υ]σμενέων Μελαμφύλλου προπάροιθεν, *Pae.*2.68-70; οὐ γὰρ καρτερόθυμος Ἄρης | κρίνει φίλον ἐν πολέμωι, τυφλὰ δ' ἐκ χειρῶν βέλη | ψυχαῖς ἔπι δυσμενέων φοιτᾶι θάνατόν τε φέρει τοῖσιν ἂν δαίμων θέλει, B.5.129-35; τί νέον ἔκλαγε χαλκοκώδων σάλπιγξ πολεμήϊαν ἀοιδάν; | ἦ τις ἁματέρας χθονὸς δυσμενὴς ὅρι' ἀμφιβάλλει στρεταγέτας ἀνήρ; B.18.3-7; B.*fr.dub.*60.9 with line 12; ἣ στάσιν ἔμφυλον πόλεμόν θ' εὕδοντ' ἐπεγείρει, | ὃς πολλῶν ἐρατὴν ὤλεσεν ἡλικίην· | ἐκ γὰρ δυσμενέων ταχέως πολυήρατον ἄστυ | τρύχεται ἐν συνόδοις τοῖς ἀδικέουσι φίλους, Sol.4.19-22 W., διὰ θεῶν πόλιν νεμόμεθ' ἀδάμαντον, | δυσμενέων δ' ὄχλον πύργος ἀποστέγει, A.*Th.*233-4, cf. 366, Sim.*Epigr.*6.215.1-2, etc. For B.13.199-209, see *CQ* 45, 1995, 327/8 with n. 47.

In the *Iliad* δυσμενής is exclusively used to refer to the relationship between Greeks and Trojans (3.51, 5.488, 6.453, 10.40, 100, 193, 221, 395, 13.263, 16.521, 17.158, 19.62, 168, 232, 22.403, 24.288, 365), whereas ἐχθρός may also refer to hostile relations within one and the same camp (9.312, of Achilles calling Agamemnon ἐχθρός; 1.176, *vice versa*; 2.200, of Thersites being ἔχθιστος to Achilles and Odysseus; 5.890, of Ares being ἔχθιστος to Zeus).

The verb **ὑπαντιάζω**/ὑπαντάω denotes 'meeting.' The verb itself is neutral as to whether one meets someone with good or bad intentions. If either one of the interpretations is specifically intended, it must appear from the context. Here both τραχεῖα and δυσμενέων κράτει unequivocally indicate that Hesychia 'opposes' her enemies with hostile intent.

Cf. εἰ δέ τις ἀρκέων φίλοις | ἐχθροῖσι τραχὺς ὑπαντιάζει, *Pae.*2.31/2. In ἑκόντι τοίνυν πρέπει | νόωι τὸν εὐεργέταν ὑπαντιάσαι, *P.*5.43/4, the context makes clear unequivocally that the well-doer is to be met with the best of

intentions. Cf. also line 59 below. In τῶν δ' ἀκούϲαιϲ αὐτὸϲ ὑπαντίαϲεν | τυροῦϲ ἐραϲιπλοκάμου γενεά, *P.*4.135/6, there is nothing in the context that makes clear with what intentions Pelias meets Jason and his kinsmen. The neutrality in this respect is constitutive of a certain suspense.

The noun **κράτοϲ** denotes (physical) 'strength' (*Il.*7.142, 13.484, *Od.*9.393, etc.), not seldom with the connotations of 'superiority, power' (*O.*6.96, *O.*10.82, *N.*4.68, *Il.*2.118, 12.214, *Od.*1.359, A.*Pr.*527, *Ag.*258, *Eu.*27, etc.). The noun may refer to 'success, victory,' as the result of superior physical strength or power (especially in the specific context of athletic competition: *O.*1.22, 78, *I.*8.5; cf. also *Il.*1.509, 6.387, *Od.*21.280, A.*Supp.*951, S.*El.*85, etc.). Here the noun refers to the 'strength' of Hesychia's enemies. It is clear that the connotations of 'superiority' are not being activated by the context, because Hesychia wins. The assumption that κράτοϲ necessarily denotes superiority led H. Fränkel to read δυϲμενέϲιν.[21] However, a reference to strength that is in the end subdued is not irreconcilable with the denotation of the noun. The fact that the connotations of superiority are inactive here is insufficient ground for conjecture. Moreover, a reference to the strength of Hesychia's enemies is not unfunctional, since this reference is also illustrative of *her* power: whatever strength or power is used by those violating her principles is irrelevant: she will overcome.

11-12. τιθεῖϲ | ὕβριν ἐν ἄντλωι

'You clap Hybris in the bilge.' By fiercely opposing her enemies, Hesychia cancels out hybris. Political tranquility depends upon the recognition of agreements made with respect to the division of power and property (Dika, cf. lines 1/2). Whenever these cease to be recognized, *hybris* and *bia* have full scope, resulting in ϲτάϲιϲ or πόλεμοϲ (cf. Thgn.39-52, cited above in my note on 1/2, p. 468).

ὕβριϲ covers all acts that arise from exceeding one's own limits and from unlawfully interfering with someone else's province, i.e., from exceeding one's bounds. In actual practice this often implies violence.

For the opposition ἡϲυχία *vs.* ὕβριϲ in a context of peace and war, cf. *P.*1.69-75 (quoted in my note on lines 1-2 above, p. 467). In A.*Pers.* 821-8, Darius' goast characterizes the Persian invasion of Hellas as driven by ὕβριϲ, consisting in despising τὸν παρόντα δαίμονα and wanting (by force)

---

[21] "Κράτοϲ ist so gut wie immer, und stets bei Pindar, 'Überlegenheit' und 'siegreiche Gewalt.' Deshalb schreibe ich, wenn auch zweifelnd, δυϲμενέϲιν nach der Parallelstelle *Pae.*2.21, wo ἐχθροῖϲ Dativobjekt zu τραχὺϲ ὑπαντιάζει ist." (*Wege und Formen*, p. 568, n. 2). Fränkel's conjecture is accepted by Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 219 (she renders 'harsh you oppose your enemies with your power') and Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 565).

to acquire what belongs to others; such an attitude is punished. In A.*Ag.*764-81 (where, admittedly, the text is extremely uncertain), ὕβρις is associated with κότος (767), ἀνίερον θράσος (769/70), and ἄτη (770); thus it leads to misery; Δίκα is the opposite of this complex; she directs everything to its proper end (772-81). Hesychia's aversion to *hybris* runs in the family: Θέμις and her daughters Εὐνομία, Δίκα and Εἰρήνα want to ἀλέξειν | Ὕβριν, Κόρου ματέρα θρασύμυθον, *O.*13.6-10. Also, at *P.*11.55/6, ἡσυχία is, as the state of mind to be desired, opposed to ὕβρις: εἴ τις ἄκρον ἑλὼν ἡσυχίαι τε νεμόμενος αἰνὰν ὕβριν | ἀπέφυγεν. For Eunomia cancelling out Hybris see also Sol.*fr.*4.32-9 W. (quoted in my note on lines 1-2 above, p. 469). For the opposition of δίκη and ὕβρις, cf. Hes.*Op.*190/1, 213, 217, 225, 238, *Od.*6.120, Archil.177.3/4, Thgn.291/2, 378/9, 751, Xenoph.B.1.15-7, etc. For the association of ὕβρις and βίη cf. *Od.*15.329. For ὕβρις involving violence cf. also ὑπερφιάλου | ἀγεμόνος δείσαντες ὕβριν, *P.*4.111/2, about parents who are afraid that the king might kill their son; ἄμυνεν ὕβριν κνωδάλων, *N.*1.50, said of Alcmene who jumps out of bed to defend Heracles against the snakes threatening him; ἀλλά νιν ὕβρις εἰς ἀυάταν | ὦρσεν, *P.*2.28/9, etc. For an overview of the different interpretations of Ἀπόλλων | χαίρει, γελᾶι θ' ὁρῶν ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων, *P.*10.35/6, see Bernardini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 634/5).

ἄντλος is 'bilge-water,' which gathers in the hold of a vessel. Cf. ναύταις γὰρ ἦν μὲν μέτρις ἦι χειμὼν φέρειν, | προθυμίαν ἔχουσι σωθῆναι πόνων, | ὃ μὲν παρ' οἴακ', ὃ δ' ἐπὶ λαίφεσιν βεβώς, | ὃ δ' ἄντλον εἴργων ναός, E.*Tr.*688-91; ἱστοῦ δὲ προτόνους ἔρρηξ' ἀνέμοιο θύελλα | ἀμφοτέρους, ἱστὸς δ' ὀπίσω πέσεν, ὅπλα τε πάντα | εἰς ἄντλον κατέχυνθ', *Od.*12.409-11. In the famous allegory of the 'ship of state' by Alcaeus, the oncoming bilge water is one of the bad things the ship is suffering: ἀσυν⟨ν⟩έτημμι τὼν ἀνέμων στάσιν, | τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῦμα κυλίνδεται, | τὸ δ' ἔνθεν, ἄμμες δ' ὂν τὸ μέσσον | νᾶϊ φορήμεθα σὺν μελαίναι | χείμωνι μόχθεντες μεγάλωι μάλα· | πὲρ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἰστοπέδαν ἔχει, | λαῖφος δὲ πὰν ζάδηλον ἤδη, | καὶ λάκιδες μέγαλαι κὰτ αὖτο, | χάλαισι δ' ἄγκυραι, Alc.*fr.*208.1-9 V. The Σ. *ad h.l* (14, II 208 Dr.) compares τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα γυναῖκα βάλ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα, | ἄντλωι δ' ἐνδούπησε πεσοῦσ' ὡς εἰναλία κήξ, *Od.*15.479, of Eumaeus' mother meeting her death aboard a Phoenician ship, falling into the bilge water like a sea-swallow darts into the water. In πόλις δ' ἐν εὐδίαι τε καὶ κλυδωνίου | πολλαῖσι πληγαῖς ἄντλον οὐκ ἐδέξατο, A.*Th.*768/9, the πόλις is compared to a ship that went through a heavy storm without too much damage; it did not start to leak. Perhaps ἄντλον οὐκ ἐδέξατο specifically hints at an interpretation 'it did not receive enemies within its walls.' In ἢ κακὸν λόγον | κτήσηι πρὸς ἀστῶν, εἰ γέροντος οὕνεκα, | τύμβου, τὸ μηδὲν ὄντος, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος, | παίδων ⟨τε⟩ τῶνδ', ἐς ἄντλον ἐμβήσηι πόδα, E.*Heracl.*165-8, 'stepping into the bilge-water' is an image for taking a risky course of action, bringing into trouble. The image is unclear in ἀλίμενόν τις ὡς εἰς ἄντλον πεσὼν | λέχριος ἐκπεσῆι φίλας καρδίας, | ἀμέρσας βίοτον, E.*Hec.*1025-8; ἀλίμενον seems to suggest that ἄντλος is metaphorically used for 'open sea'; 'falling into the sea without a harbour in sight' then in turn would be an image for having got into very much trouble indeed. In the only

other Pindaric passage in which the noun occurs, it is a metaphor for the great flood: λέγοντι μάν | χθόνα μὲν κατακλύcαι μέλαιναν | ὕδατος cθένος, ἀλλά | Ζηνὸς τέχναις ἀνάπωτιν ἐξαίφνας | ἄντλον ἑλεῖν, *O.*9.49-53. See further Van Nes, *Maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos*, pp. 86, 143-5; Péron, *Images maritimes*, pp. 223/4.

Although the precise implications of the image are difficult to get a grip on, it is clear that the tenor must be that Hesychia subdues hybris. The naval imagery must certainly have had a certain appeal to Pindar's Aeginetan audience (cf. my note on *N.*5.2, pp. 101/2). Possibly ἐν ἄντλωι implies a specification of the martial images conjured up in the preceding lines in that it envisages a sea battle. Then Hesychia's subduction of hybris is metaphorically described as her scuttling the ship of hybris, so to speak. It is attractive to connect this interpretation with the naval rivalry between Aegina and Athens. Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, pp. 565/6) intrestingly remarks: "l'ἄντλος è la parte inferiore, contrapposta alla parte superiore, la poppa, dove sono gli organi di commando," quoting ὅcτιc φυλάccει πρᾶγος ἐν πρύμνηι πόλεως | οἴακα νωμῶν, A.*Th.*2/3, and *sedebamus ... in puppi et clavum tenebamus; nunc autem vix est in sentina locus*, Cic.*Fam.*9.15.3; "perciò 'mettere l'insolenza in fondo alla sentina' non vuol dire altro che renderla politicamente inoffensiva." This interpretation points at a relevance to internal Aeginetan politics. One interpretation does not exclude the other.[22] See interpretation, pp. 433/4.

12-13. τὰν οὐδὲ Πορφυρίων μάθεν | παρ' αἶcαν ἐξερεθίζων

'Porphyrion did not understand that he roused her (Hesychia) to fight (by acting) in defiance of his role.' The antecedent of τάν must be Hesychia, since referring it to the closest noun with which it agrees in gender and number (ὕβριc) does not yield sense. Thus τάν effects the transition from invocation to narrative. τάν is object of ἐξερεθίζων, which depends on μάθεν.

For the construction cf. καὶ τήνδε νῦν πόρπαcον ἀcφαλῶc, ἵνα | μάθηι cωφιcτὴc ὢν Διὸc νωθέcτεροc, A.*Pr.*61/2; εἰc τῶν ἐν 'Αΐδου μάνθαν' ἐνθάδ' ὢν ἀνήρ, S.*El.*1342; διαβεβλημένος ὑπὸ 'Αμάcιοc οὐ μανθάνειc, Hdt.3.1.4; εἰ μὴ μανθάνετε κακὰ cπεύδοντεc, Th.6.39. Cf. further γινώcκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ μοῖcαν μοῖcαν παρέχων ἄλιc, *Pae.*4.23/4; θνατὰ μεμνάcθω περιcτέλλων μέλη, *N.*11.15; ἴcτω γὰρ ἐν τούτωι πεδίλωι δαιμόνιον πόδ' ἔχων, *O.*6.8, etc. Cf. Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 281/2 (§ 354). For the shift from second to third person, cf. χρυcέα φόρμιγξ ... · τᾶc ἀκούει ... ὁπόταν ... τεύχηιc, *P.*1.1-4, with

[22] Part of the point may also be that ὕβριc, which is (by folk etymology al least) 'above' (ὑπέρ), is thrown down into the bottom of the ship. For the association of ὕβριc and ὑπέρ cf. *AP* 5.49 (Gallus), a passage of no interest to English readers.

Cingano *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 327). See further Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 85-117; further references are to be found therein.

One's **αἶσα** is the 'portion of life, destiny' that is inherent to what someone is. Porphyrion acted in defiance of his role in the universe by climbing the Olympus in order to overthrow the dominion of the gods. See further my note on *N.*3.16 (pp. 627-30). Grammatically παρ' αἶσαν goes with ἐξερεθίζων, but in sense it qualifies an implied action that is the cause of Porphyrion's ἐξερεθίζων Hesychia: Porphyrion acted in defiance of his αἶσα by attempting to overthrow the gods,[23] and thus provoked a violent response on Hesychia's part. Lines 17/8 make clear that Hesychia's punishment of Porphyrion has been executed by Apollo.

The verb **ἐξερεθίζω** occurs only here in Pindar. It is a strengthened form of the simplex ἐρεθίζω, which refers to causing quite a high degree of irritation, often such as to provoke a violent response, more often meaning 'rousing to fight' than 'rousing to anger' (cf. LSJ *s.v.*).

For the simplex cf., e.g., ἀλλ' ἴθι, μή μ' ἐρέθιζε, σαώτερος ὥς κε νέηαι, *Il.*1.32; ὥς τίς τε λέων ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο, | ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ κε κάμῃσι κύνας τ' ἄνδρας τ' ἐρεθίζων, οἵ τέ μιν οὐκ εἰῶσι βοῶν ἐκ πῖαρ ἑλέσθαι, *Il.*17.657-9. The simplex is restored in: ἐγὼ μ[ ] | παῦρα μελ[ι]ζομεν[ ] | [γλώ]σσαργον ἀμφέπω[ν ἐρε]θίζομαι πρὸς ἀῦτα[ν, *fr.*140b11-14 (cf. Plut.*SollAnim.*36 [p. 984]). The compound is paralleled only by some rather late passages: J.*Vit.*151, Plu.*Cim.*15.3; *Sull.*13.1, *Cic.*14.2, *Brut.*31.3, Crateuas *fr.*8.7, Dam.*Phileb.*146.4, Greg.Nyss.*Or.Dom.*5 (308.27), Marcellin.*Puls.*422, Ph. *Spec.Leg.* 4.139.5, Philostr.*Im.*2.17.5.

οὐδέ is adverbial here, for it does not coordinate this sentence with the preceding context.[24] There are a few parallels in Pindar to such an adverbial, not sentence initial[25] οὐδέ. These passages have in common that a corresponding clause with *a fortiori* force, of the type 'let alone anything/anyone else,' is implied. Thus, the traditional rendering 'not even' of such instances seems to the point. If this is

---

[23] It has been a disputed point what the particular sin of the King of the Giants was. But Pindar does not allude to a specific crime of Porphyrion (e.g., assaulting Hera, as Apollodorus says, or stealing Heracles' cattle, as the scholiast has it). As the King of the Giants, he is guilty of their collective crime.

[24] That there is no other οὐδέ in the vicinity is not substantial. For οὐδέ is not οὔτε; one does not *expect* to find it linked with a corresponding or reciprocal οὐδέ. "Kühner (II ii, p. 294, § 535.5) observes that, when one οὐδέ is followed by another, the two never stand in reciprocal relation, like οὔτε ... οὔτε: but that either (a) the first is adverbial, the second connective: or (b) both are connective," Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 193. As Prof. Miller pointed out to me in a personal letter, in *Pae.*6.110, cited by Slater under οὐδέ ... οὐδέ, the first οὐδέ connects ἐξίκετο with ἔλαθεν ('he arrived ... and he did not escape'), the second links ἑκάβολον with ἀνέμους.

[25] "Connective οὐδέ is invariably first word in the sentence, clause, or word-group," Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 199.

indeed the value of οὐδέ here, we ought to infer that the assertion that 'not even Porphyrion realised that he was rousing Hesychia to fight,' singles out the king of Giants as a very clear example of someone violating Hesychia's principles.

Cf. τῶν δὲ πεπραγμένων | ἐν δίκαι τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν ἀποίητον οὐδ' ἂν | Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατὴρ δύναιτο θέμεν ἔργων τέλος, *O.*2.16, 'not even father Time,' which seems to imply 'let alone anyone else'; χρὴ δὲ πρὸς θεὸν οὐκ ἐρίζειν, | ὃς ἀνέχει τοτὲ μὲν τὰ κείνων, τότ' αὖθ' ἑτέροις ἔδωκεν μέγα κῦδος. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ταῦτα νόον | ἰαίνει φθονέρων, *P.*2.88-90, where the φθόνεροι are 'not even' pleased by the instability of divine favour, let alone by someone who enjoys it at the moment. A comparable single οὐδέ (οὔτε codd.) has been conjectured in *O.*14.8 and *I.*8.56. See further Kühner-Gerth, II ii, pp. 294/5 (§ 535 sub 7), with many more examples.

• *Porphyrion; Mythological Background:* The Giants, brothers of the Titans, were tall and terrible creatures who made war upon the Olympians. Porphyrion was their king (as he must be the βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων, 17).

The Giants are mentioned first in the *Odyssey*, which presents them as a wild and super-human race, along with the Cyclops and Laestrygones (*Od.*7.206, 10.120). Eurymedon is mentioned as their king; he is said to have led his race and himself to destruction (*Od.*7.59/60), which could be an allusion to the Gigantomachia. According to Hesiod (*Th.*183-7), the Giants were born from Gaea and Uranus' blood (as are the Erinyes, among others). Hesiod does not refer to any battle between the Giants and the gods. The oldest explicit references to such a battle known to us are to be found in Xenophanes (ἀνδρῶν δ' αἰνεῖν τοῦτον ὃς ἐσθλὰ πιὼν ἀναφαίνει, | ὡς ἧι μνημοσύνη καὶ τόνος ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς, | οὔ τι μάχας διέπων Τιτήνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων | ουδέ ⟨τι⟩ Κενταύρων, πλάσματα τῶν προτέρων, *fr.*B1.19-22 W.), and Ibycus (μάχαι γίγαντες, *fr.* 27, *P.Oxy.*2735, Page, *SLG* 192, p. 57, *fr.* S192 Davies, p. 258). Pindar mentions the battle between the Giants and the Olympic gods in καί τινα σὺν πλαγίωι | ἀνδρῶν κόρωι στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον | φᾶσέ (*sc.* Tiresias) νιν (*sc.* Heracles) δώσειν μόρωι. | καὶ γὰρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν πεδίωι Φλέγρας Γιγάντεσσι μάχαν | ἀντιάζωσιν, βελέων ὑπὸ ῥιπαῖσι κείνου φαιδίμαν γαίαι πεφύρσεσθαι κόμαν | ἔνεπεν, *N.*1.64-70. A detailed account of the Gigantomachia is given in Apollod.1.6.1/2. Further sources include Tz.*Lycophr.*63, Hor.*C.*3.4.49ff., Ov.*Met.*1.150ff., Claudian, *Gigantomachia.* See further: M. Mayer, *Die Giganten und Titanen*, Berlin 1987; Kuhnert in Roscher I, 1664ff; Waser, *RE*, Suppl. III, pp. 655-759; Vian, *LIMC* 4.1, 191-6; *Guerre des Géants*, Paris 1952, esp. p. 187.

Porphyrion is one of the Giants who got most media attention. Apollodorus singles him out together with Alcyoneus (διέφερον δὲ πάντων Πορφυρίων τε καὶ 'Αλκυονεύς, ὃς δὴ καὶ ἀθάνατος ἦν ἐν ἧιπερ ἐγεννήθη γῆι μαχόμενος, 1.6.1; Alcyoneus is mentioned by Pindar in *N.*4.27 and *I.*6.33). Apollodorus says that he attacked Heracles and Hera; Zeus inspired him with lust for Hera, and when he tore her

robes to shreds and would have forced her, she called for help, whereupon Zeus smote him with a thunderbolt andf Heracles shot him dead with an arrow (1.6.2). Tzetzes (*Lycophr.*63) agrees with Apollodorus' account of Porphyrion's death. In our ode, Porphyrion is the king of the Giants (17). Pindar says that Apollo shot him (17/8), not Heracles. See my note on 17/8 below (pp. 497).

13-15

Gain is most persistent if one fetches it from the house of a willing giver. Force in the long run ruins even someone with great self-confidence.

13-14. κέρδος δὲ φίλτατον, | ἑκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι
'Gain is most persistent if one fetches it from the house of a willing giver,' i.e., gain is not φίλος, does not abide by one, if one takes it from someone who is unwilling to give it, so by force. Both *gnomai* (13-5), applying to Porphyrion's and Typhos' behaviour, may be applied directly to Athenian policy.[26] See interpretation, pp. 433/4.

Pindar is refurbishing Hesiod's δὼς ἀγαθή, ἅρπαξ δὲ κακή, θανάτοιο δότειρα. | ὃς μὲν γάρ κεν ἀνὴρ ἐθέλων—ὅ γε καὶ μέγα δοίη—, | χαίρει τῶι δώρωι καὶ τέρπεται ὃν κατὰ θυμόν· | ὃς δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕληται ἀναιδείηφι πιθήσας, | καί τε σμικρὸν ἐόν, τό γ' ἐπάχνωσεν φίλον ἦτορ, *Op.*356-60. However, the absence of any verbal similarities does not plead in favour of assuming an intentional citation which the audience is meant to recognize.

Pindar explicitly quotes Hesiod in: Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν | ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾶι τοῦτ' ἔπος, *I.*6.66/7, which refers to μελέτη δέ τε ἔργον ὀφέλλει, Hes.*Op.*412. There are some further echoes of Hesiod: ἕπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάστωι | μέτρον· νοῆσαι δὲ καιρὸς ἄριστος, *O.*13.47/8 (and, to a lesser extent, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως | παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν, *P.*9.78/9, cf. Carey *ad loc.*, p. 89) is reminiscent of μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι· καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος, Hes.*Op.*694. φίλον εἴη φιλεῖν, *P.*2.83, echoes τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν, Hes.*Op.*353. Whether σμικρὸς ἐν σμικροῖς, μέγας ἐν μεγάλοις | ἔσσομαι, *P.*3.107-8, echoes εἰ γάρ κεν καὶ σμικρὸν ἐπὶ σμικρῶι καταθεῖο | καὶ θαμὰ τοῦτ' ἔρδοις, τάχα κεν μέγα καὶ τὸ γένοιτο, Hes.*Op.*361/2, is more doubtful, for in spite of the verbal similarities the thoughts expressed in are quite different. It is worth noting that all these echoes are from the *Works and Days*. I am not aware of any reminiscences of the *Theogony*. Moreover, it is remarkable that three (including *h.l.*) out of these five echoes are from one short passage: *Op.*353-62. In *P.*6.20-7 Pindar seems to quote from the Χίρωνος ὑποθῆκαι (*fr.*283 M.-W.; cf. the Σ. *ad loc.*; see further Giannini *ad loc.*, in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 546/7). For Homer citations in Pindar cf. my note on *N.*3.52/3 (pp. 351/2). Bacchylides explicitly quotes

---

[26] Cf. Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 157; Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 300).

Hesiod in Βοιωτὸϲ ἀνὴρ τᾶδε φών[ηϲεν, γλυκειᾶν] Ἡϲίοδοϲ πρόπολοϲ | Μουϲᾶν, ὃν ⟨ἂν⟩ ἀθάνατοι τι[μῶϲι, τούτωι] καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπ[εϲθαι], B.5.191-4, which is either a reference to a lost work (hence *fr.*344 M.-W.) or, more plausibly, a summary allusion to Hes.*Th.*81-97 responding to implicit allusions to the *Theogony* in the opening sections of the ode: see Cairns, *Scholia* 6, 1997, 38 (further references are to be found therein). For intertextuality in Bacchylides see further my 'Bacchylides' Homer, His Tragedy, & His Pindar', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999.

For the thought it is instructive to compare ἂν μὲν ἑκὼν παρ' ἑκόντοϲ τιϲ λάβηι, ... ἂν δὲ μικροῦ πάνυ τιμήματοϲ ἄξιόν τιϲ λάβηι, βίαι δὲ τοῦτ' ἀφέληται, κτλ, D.21.44.

It is easy to over-emphasize the affective connotations of **φίλοϲ**. In archaic Greek usage φίλοϲ is a more objective notion than is implied by a rendering 'dear.' One's φίλοϲ is a person to whom one stands in an objectively defined relationship of mutual solidarity, rather than a person whom one holds in special regard on the basis of personal liking. Thus a φίλοϲ is 'one of us,' pre-eminently someone belonging to are associated with one's οἶκοϲ, not necessarily a friend or a beloved one. What is φίλον to one, belongs to one or is part of one's οἶκοϲ. Thus the implications of this *gnome* are not that profit taken by force will not be 'dear,' but that it will not prove to be φίλοϲ in that it will not belong to one for very long. The idea is that gain that is won by force will be eaily lost again.

One's relatives are pre-eminently φίλοι, as they belong to one's own οἶκοϲ: παιϲὶν φίλοιϲ, *O.*7.41; φίλα μᾶτερ, 98, *P.*5.114, *P.*9.61; φίλα τέκν', *fr.*171; cf. *I.*1.5, *N.*10.55. Similarly, in ἕκαϲται φίλτατον | παρθενικαὶ πόϲιν ἢ | υἱὸν εὔχοντ', ὦ Τελεϲίκρατεϲ, ἔμμεν, *P.*9.98-100, φίλτατον does not imply romance; the girls want Tesicrates to be 'their own' husband or son. In ἀμφιπόλοιϲ δὲ [κ]υρ[ιᾶν] περὶ τιμᾶν | [δηρι]αζόμενον κτάνεν | [ἐν τεμέ]νεϊ φίλωι γᾶϲ περ' ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύν, *Pae.*6.117-20, φίλωι indicates that Apollo killed Neoptolemus in his 'own' temple. Cf. also phrases like φίλον ἦτορ, *O.*1.4, *Pae.*6.12; φίλα ψυχά, *P.*3.61. What makes Pindar's description his personal bonds with the victor in φιλέων φιλέοντ', *P.*10.66, so strikingly far-reaching (see introduction, pp. 9-10) is exactly that the phrase appeals to an objective tie in the context of the οἶκοϲ (cf. the reciprocity claim in ἄγων ἄγοντα) rather than to friendship based on personal liking.

•*Optative:* For εἰ with the optative cf. καιρὸν εἰ φθέγξαιο, πολλῶν πείρατα ϲυντανύϲαιϲ | ἐν βραχεῖ, μείων ἕπεται μῶμοϲ ἀνθρώπων, *P.*1.81/2; οὐ γὰρ πάγοϲ οὐδὲ προϲάντηϲ ἁ κέλευθοϲ γίνεται, | εἴ τιϲ εὐδόξων ἐϲ ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰϲ Ἑλικωνιάδων, *I.*2.33/4; εἰ ϲὺν πόνωι τιϲ εὖ πράϲϲοι, μελιγάρυεϲ ὕμνοι | ὑϲτέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων | τέλλεται, *O.*11.4-6. These passages have in common with *h.l.* that, in keeping with the gnomic character of the statement, the εἰ clause formulates a gener-

al, hypothetical condition. Gildersleeve (*ad h.l.*, p. 328) attributes to the optative the value of expressing "the desirable course."

Cf. also *Il.*9.318, *Od.*5.484, 7.51, 8.138, 14.56, S.*Ant.*1031/2, etc. Different is: εἰ δὲ δαίμων γενέθλιος ἕρποι, | Δὶ τοῦτ' Ἐνυαλίωι τ' ἐκδώσομεν πράσσειν, *O.*13.105/6, where a wish is presented as a hypothetical condition; here the optative takes away the danger of giving a over-confident, hybristic impression. Cf. πάντ' ἔχεις, | εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν, *I.*5.14/5. For εἰ with an optative and κε in the main clause, cf. *O.*6.4-6, *O.*1.108-10, *P.*3.110/1.

On εἰ with optative see further: Gildersleeve's introduction to his commentary, p. cvii; Gildersleeve, 'The conditional sentence,' p. 443; Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, 168/9; Humbert, *Syntaxe Grecque*, 221-3; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 354-6; Kühner-Gerth, II, 477-80; R. van Pottelbergh, *Over de geschiedenis en de betekenis van den* εἰ-*zin in het Grieksch*, Gent 1939, pp. 30-1; Ruijgh, τε *épique*, 293-6, Schwyzer-Debrunner, 685, Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, Heidelberg 1907, 396-404; Wakker, *Conditions and Conditionals*, pp. 176-9.

The verb **φέροι** may qualify as 'colourless' (see introduction, pp. 31/2) to the extent that the crucial information is conveyed by ἑκόντος and by the contrast with βία in the next line. φέροι, in itself, could be used both for 'taking' by force and for 'accepting' a voluntary donation. The low profile of the verb as to information status goes to highlight the contrasting concepts of ἑκόντος and βία.

15. βία δὲ καὶ μεγάλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνωι

'Force ruins even someone with a proud confidence in the long run.' Are the person using βία and the one who is μεγάλαυχος one and the same person? The preceding *gnome*, that 'gain is most persistent when fetched from the house of a willing giver,' leads one to regard the person using βία and the μεγάλαυχος as one and the same person. Then, the second *gnome* mirrors the first one exactly, in that it illustrates the negative side of the same principle: ἑκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι suggests as its opposite 'fetching things from someone who does not want to give them,' which inevitably implies the use of force; the long term negative effects that βία has, work well as the opposite of 'persistent gain.' Thus the hearer will naturally interpret this line as meaning that βία in the long run ruins the person who uses it.[27] However, the following lines about Typhos and the king of the Giants suggest the other interpretation. In wanting to overthrow the gods, Typhos and Porphyrion were guilty of *hybris* and μεγάλαυχοι in the wrong way, and they were punished for that: they could not avert βία; they were slain by the force of the gods, re-

---

[27] Thus Farnell *ad loc.* (II, p. 194).

presented here by Zeus' thunder-bold and Apollo's arrows. The fact that μιν in 16 refers to βία (see below) steers the hearer to re-assess his interpretation of the *gnome* and to take it, in retrospect, to mean also that μεγάλαυχοι are ruined by the force of others. It is this (sequential) polyinterpretability that gives the *gnome* its full significance. The two interpretations merge. βία in the long run ruins the person who uses it; he, in turn, is met by βία. This is exactly in keeping with what has been said about Hesychia: she acts mildly when midly acted upon, but when confronted with ἀμείλιχος κότος and *hybris*, she responds in the same forceful manner, being τραχεῖα. This second *gnome*, too, may be applied to Athens. See interpretation, pp. 433/4.

For **βία** of punishing gods cf. θεῶν βία | καὶ νέμεςις, οἵπερ ἔργ' ἀμύνουςι κακά, S.*Ph.*601/2; cf. also δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις βίαιος[28] ςέλμα ςεμνὸν ἡμένων, A.*Ag.*182/3.[29] For βία referring to the violence used by the gods in fights cf. Κρόνος ... | νικηθεὶς τέχνηιςι βίηφί τε παιδὸς ἑοῖο, Hes.*Th.*495/6 (cf. 490/1), of Zeus subduing Cronus by force; ὑμεῖς δὲ μεγάλην τε βίην καὶ χεῖρας ἀάπτους | φαίνετε Τιτήνεςςιν ἐναντίοι ἐν δαῒ λυγρῆι, Hes.*Th.*649/50 (cf. 677); αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεςςαν, | Τιτήνεςςι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι, κτλ., *ibid.*882; οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι Ζεὺς ἴςχεν ἑὸν μένος, ἀλλά νυ τοῦ γε | εἶθαρ μὲν μένεος πλῆντο φρένες, ἐκ δέ τε πᾶςαν | φαῖνε βίην· ἄμυδις δ' ἄρ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἠδ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου | ἀςτράπτων ἔςτειχε ςυνωχαδόν· οἱ δὲ κεραυνοί κτλ., *ibid.*687-90. Cf. also Call.*Jov.*66. For βία as a positive notion, referring to the strength of a victorious athlete, see my note on *N.*5.19 (p. 128). For the periphrastical usage of βία see my note on *N.*5.12 (p. 116).

For the technique of sequential (as opposed to simultaneous) polyinterpretability, cf. two instances of the image of the eagle. In *N.*3.80-2 the audience is at first led to apply the image of the eagle to the poet, but once they hear 83/4 they are prompted to reconsider the equation and decide that the image applies to the victor as well (see my remarks *ad loc.*, pp. 221-3). In B.5.16-30 it is the other way around. The image of the eagle first illustrates the superiority of the victor. The characterization of the eagle as a herald anticipates a shift of reference from victor to poet. The passage then ends with an explicit application of the image to the poet. See further *CPh* 89, 1994, 305-17.

For **ἐν χρόνωι**, 'in the long run,' cf. *P.*3.96, 4.291 (with Braswell *ad loc.*), *fr.*33b, A.*Eu.*1000. For the idea cf. τῶι δὲ χρόνωι πάντως ἦλθ' ἀποτειςομένη (*sc.* Δίκη), Sol.*fr.*4.16 W.; ἑκὼν δ' ἀνάγκας ἄτερ δίκαιος ὢν | οὐκ ἄνολβος ἔςται, | πανώλεθρος ⟨δ'⟩ οὔποτ' ἂν γένοιτο. | τὸν ἀντίτολμον δέ φαμι

---

[28] Turnebus: βιαίως codd., accepted by Fraenkel. But see Denniston & Page *ad loc.* (p. 85).

[29] I leave Aechylus' *Prometheus Bound*, where Bia is a character, underscoring the portrayal of Zeus as a harsh and selfish despot who rules by force rather than law, out of account.

παρβάδαν | ἄγοντα πολλὰ παντόφυρτ' ἄνευ δίκας | βιαίως ξὺν χρόνωι καθήςειν | λαῖφος, ὅταν λάβηι πόνος | θραυομένας κεραίας, A.*Eu.*550-7; cf. also ἐν δίκηι χρόνου, Sol.*fr.*36.3 W. See also Gargiulo, *QUCC*, 5, 1980, 34 ff.

• *Semantics:* A person who is **μεγάλαυχος** thinks highly of himself, has a proud confidence. This is a reprehensible quality only if it is unjustified. Here, in keeping with the generic character of the *gnome*, μεγάλαυχον is neutral as for moral judgement. It is βία (his using it or others using it against him) that causes the undoing of any such a person, not that he has a proud confidence. In fact, his being μεγάλαυχος would in itself be a reason for assuming that he could successfully use violence, or resist the force of others. It is this assumption that this *gnome* takes a stand against. For this is the force of **καί**.

In ὦ Ζεῦ βαcιλεῦ, νῦν ⟨δὴ⟩ Περcῶν | τῶν μεγαλαύχων καὶ πολυάνδρων | cτρατίαν ὀλέcαc, A.*Pers.*523-4, the chorus of Persian gerontes are characterizing their own people as having a proud confidence. This is as positive a qualification as πολυάνδρων. The passage gives voice to the disbelief that it was possible for such an excellent nation to be overcome. Cf. also ἀλλὰ βροτῶν τὸν μὲν κενεόφρενες αὖχαι | ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον· τὸν δ' αὖ καταμεμφθέντ' ἄγαν | ἰcχὺν οἰκείων παρέcφαλεν καλῶν | χειρὸc ἕλκων ὀπίccω θυμὸc ἄτολμοc ἐών, *N.*11.29-32, where κενεόφρενεc makes clear that the αὖχαι are unjustified, and therefore harmful; they are opposed to a θυμὸc ἄτολμοc, which is equally ineffective. The opposition makes clear that αὖχαι are potentially constructive, in that they may lead to courage, if only they are based on reality.

The verb αὐχέω, as Barrett rightly argues (on E.*Hipp.*922-5, pp. 343/4), "denotes a *mental attitude*, and means first 'feel confident,' then sometimes 'feel a proud confidence, pride oneself'; the meaning 'boast' commonly alleged by lexica and editors is unknown to early Greek." (p. 343). See also Fraenkel on A.*Ag.*1497 (pp. 707/8).

For **cφάλλω**, cf. esp. ὀργῆι γὰρ ὅcτιc εὐθέωc χαρίζεται, | κακῶc τελευτᾶι· πλεῖcτα γὰρ cφάλλει βροτούc, E.*fr.*31 N.; cf. also καὶ κρέccον' ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων | ἔcφαλε τέχνα καταμάρψαιc', *I.*4.34/5, illustrated by the case of Ajax; 'Αχιλλέα ... ὃc Ἕκτορα cφᾶλε, *O.*2.81, etc. The aorist is 'gnomic' (see Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 36/7).

16-20

Typhos the Cilician with hundred heads did not escape this, nor did the king of the Giants. They were killed by the thunderbolt and by the bow of Apollo, who with benevolent mind received from Cirrha the son of Xenarces, crowned with Parnassian grass and a Dorian revel.

16. Τυφὼc Κίλιξ ἑκατόγκρανοc οὔ μιν ἄλυξεν

Like the Giants, Typhos wanted to overthrow their dominion by force. This makes him guilty of *hybris* and μεγάλαυχοc in the wrong

way. He was slain by Zeus (see 17/8 below, with my note). This makes him an excellent illustration of the principle that 'force ruins even someone with great confidence.' In principle, the *gnome* applies to him both ways (see preceding note): his use of βία meant his undoing; he was killed by Zeus' thunder-bolt, so by βία (see preceding note; this line applies the *gnome* to Typhos only in the latter way, as μιν must refer to βία).

Commentators are all but unanimous in their referring **μιν** to Hesychia.[30] The advantage of this is clear: then, βία in the preceding line is quite clearly the violence used by the wrong-doer, not the force of the avenger; and we can see Hesychia's forces, as described in 8-12, at work agianst the two monsters. However, this interpretation is untenable. Hesychia has last been referred to by τάν in 12. From then she has been out of the picture.[31] Pragmatically, the only plausible candidate for the reference of the pronoun is βία, the subject and *topic* of the preceding sentence.[32] The assertion that neither Typhos nor Porphyrion were able to avert βία is demonstrated exactly by the fact that they were killed by Zeus and Apollo.[33] This involves a retrospective re-assessment on the part of the hearer of the preceding *gnome*, which results in a functional (sequential) polyinterpretability (see above). For μιν/νιν with a non-personal reference cf., e.g., *O.*2.56, *O.*3.45, *O.*13.69, *N.*3.11, *O.*7.67, 70, *Pae.*7b.48, etc. For my keeping of μιν (instead of following T. Mommsen in reading νιν) see my note on *N.*5.31 (pp. 154/5).

•*Mythological background:* Our sources for the Typhos myth (the most important ones include: Hes.*Th.*820-68, *Il.*2.781-5, *P.*1.15-28, *O.*4.8/9, *fr.*93, A.*Pr.*351-61, Apollod.1.6.3) are fairly numerous and consistent. Typhos is the son of Gaea and Tartarus (Hes.*Th.*821/2; cf. γηγενῆ, A.*Pr.*253). The association with Cilicia is common (cf., e.g., τόν ποτε |

---

[30] Thus, e.g., Gildesleeve, Farnell, Burton.

[31] Burton (*Pythian Odes*, p. 180) is conscious of the pragmatic improbability of referring μιν to Hesychia: "if then vv. 13-15 are all as it were in parenthesis, νιν in vs. 16 may be referred without difficulty to Ἡσυχία." The problem with this is that a llistening audience of the ode has exactly no clue that 13-5 are in parenthesis. Nothing prevents them from taking these line as a linear progression of thoughts.

[32] Thus Boeckh, Dissen, Slater *s.v.* μιν (b, p. 336), Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 567).

[33] The most plausible candidate for the reference of a pronoun can be over-ruled by the second best candidate, mentioned earlier, only if the first option does not make sense. This is what happens with τάν in 12 above, where ὕβριν is over-ruled by Hesychia as the antecedent, because the assertion that 'Porphyrion did not understand that he roused hybris to fight' does not make sense. In keeping with the 'cooperative principle,' as described by H.P. Grice, the recipient is going to test alternatives in a situation in which the most natural or obvious interpretation does not result in effective communication. If the most natural or obvious interpretation is unproblematic, alternatives will not even cross his mind.

Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον, *P.*1.16/7; Κιλικίων οἰκτῆρα ἄντρων, A.*Pr.*353; εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς, *Il.*2.783, cf. *fr.*93). One of the most eye-catching details of his repulsive physique (described at length in Hes.*Th.*820-68) is that he had one hundred heads (cf. ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων | ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος, Hes.*Th.*824/5; ἑκατοντακάρανος, *P.*1.16, *fr.*93; ἑκατογκάρανον, A.*Pr.*355; ἑκατογκεφάλα, *O.*4.9). Typhos' ambition—like that of Giants, including Porphyrion, mentioned in line 12 above—was to overthrow the dominion of the Olympians (cf. πᾶσι ἀνέστη θεοῖς, A.*Pr.*354; ὡς τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδ' ἐκπέρσων βίαι, *ibid.*357, Prometheus speaking; θεῶν πολέμιος, *P.*1.15). Zeus killed him with his thunder-bolt (ἀλλ' οἷος ἄπλατον κεράϊζες θεῶν | Τυφῶν' ..., Ζεῦ πάτερ, *fr.*93; ἀλλ' ἦλθεν αὐτῶι Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος | καταιβάτης κεραυνὸς ἐκπνέων φλόγα, | ὅς αὐτὸν ἐξέπληξε, A.*Pr.*357-60; *Il.*2.781-5; Hes.*Th.*853-68 tells the story in detail). He was locked up either in the Tartarus (Hes.*Th.*868), or underneath the Etna (*P.*1.15-28, *O.*4.8/9, *fr.*93, A.*Pr.*365-72). See further, in addition to the mythological hand-books, G. Seippel, *Der Typhonmythos*, Diss. Greifswald 1939; Cingano on *P.*1.16-28 (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 334/5); C. Bonnet, 'Typhon et Baal Saphon', *Studia Phoenicia V. Phoenicia and the East Mediterraneum in the First Millennium B.C.*, Leuven 1987, 101-43.

The verb **ἀλύσκω** occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. It is frequently used in Homer. Cf., e.g., *Il.*10.371, *Od.*2.532, 11.113, 12.335, 22.382, etc.

17. οὐδὲ μὰν βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων

The King of the Giants must be Porphyrion, who has been mentioned before, in spite of the fact that the other sources do not confirm this status (see my note on 12, pp. 489/90). Even if his royalty is a Pindaric invention, the audience would not have had any problems in understanding that here the King must be Porphyrion: the contexts leaves them no choice but to take it thus;[34] Porphyrion is one of the better known Giants, so a prominent position does not really come as a surprise.

The general force of the particle **μάν** (or μήν) seems to be described best in terms of its signaling that the speaker stands put personally for the validity of his assertion. By using μάν, the spreaker signals that, for him, what he is saying is true, even though the hearer may disagree, and that it will be useless to argue with him about the validity of his statement, because this happens to be a personal conviction.[35] Here the presence of μάν derives much of its relevance from

[34] It does not make sense to think of another Giant, whom we know to be their king from other sources (e.g., Eurymedon, who is thus referred to at *Od.*7.59); this would render the entire passage incoherent, as, then, we would have two different Giants who are not by any means connected.

[35] "With μήν ... the speaker shows himself aware that his audience may not be inclined to accept the statement, and indicates that he will nevertheless uphold it," Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 52; see also pp. 54/5.

the fact that Porphyrion has been mentioned already. The assertion that Porphyrion did not escape his punishment can be made with a strong claim to being true, because this has already been implied in 12/3. Thus, in effect, the particle has a structuring function, in that it helps to connect the statement about the King of the Giants with what has been said earlier about Porphyrion.

17-18. δμᾶθεν δὲ κεραυνῶι | τόξοιcί τ' Ἀπόλλωνοc
Who was killed by whom? Either both gods killed both monsters in cooperation, or they killed one monster each. There are no signals in the Greek that make clear what is meant, so Pindar relies on the audience's knowledge of early history. Our problem is that the tradition does not have any record of a role played by Apollo in either of the two killings.[36] The subduction of both Typhos and Porphyrion is attributed to Zeus (see my notes on 12 and 16 above, pp. 489/90, 495/6). Since the tradition is much more substantial and much more consistent for Typhos than for Porphyrion, and since all sources, including a passage elsewhere in Pindar (*fr.*93), insist that Zeus killed Typhos single-handedly, it is probably best to stick with Zeus as the sole killer of Typhos, and to postulate that Apollo's role as the killer of Porphyrion was either drawn from a branch of the tradition now lost to us, or invented by Pindar for the present purpose. If not in the context of Porphyrion specifically, Apollo plays an important role in the Gigantomachia.[37] This would facilitate the audience's acceptation of Pindar's invention, if it were one. Moreover, Apollo often acts as the executive agent of Zeus, as in *Iliad* 15.

It is clear that Apollo's role is being emphasized here, because, being the patron of the Pythian games, he is the god who granted Aristomenes his victory, as the following lines make explicit.[38] A reference to Apollo has been placed at the final position of the clause, a position frequently marked for constituents that have focus function in a high degree. This positioning has the further advantage of allowing Pindar to associate Apollo with the victory by means of a relative connection.

---

[36] Claudian's *Giantomachia* (125 ff.) records an encounter between Porphyrion and Apollo in Delos. But there is a lacuna in the text and we cannot determine whether Apollo killed Porphyrion and, if so, whether he did so with his bow. See Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, pp. 567/8).

[37] According to Apollod.1.6.2, Apollo killed Ephialtes (in cooperation with Heracles).

[38] Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 568) draws attention to the Apollo cult in Aegina (citing Paus.2.30.1).

18. ὅϲ

The relative pronoun effects a smooth transition from Zeus' and Apollo's killing of monsters to the scene of the victory, Delphi, Apollo's home. The relative disguises the reference to the κῶμοϲ in Delphi as if it were a mere afterthought: on the level of the extemporizing fiction, the poet pretends that the κῶμοϲ leaps to his mind as an association occasioned by Apollo whom he has just mentioned (cf. the verbal aspect of ἔδεκτο; see further introduction, pp. 34-41). On the level of the poet's real compositional concerns, Pindar's presentation, apart from effecting a striking emotional shift (see next note), clearly aims at associating Aristomenes' victory as closely as possible with the punishment of Porphyrion (and Typhos). The god who killed them is the very god who granted Aristomenes his victory. See further my interpretation, p. 434.

18. εὐμενεῖ νόωι

Apollo received the festive procession coming up from Cirrha to his temple in Delphi 'with a friendly mind.' After an elaborative account of Hesychia's fierce and aggressive side, leading over into references to Porphyrion and Typhos, scaring monsters who were once a threat to the world order, and the reference to their being killed by Zeus and Apollo (17/8), which brings the grim atmosphere to a climax, there is sudden change of mood to the spontaneous outburstings of joy after victory, with a vivid description of the impromptu κῶμοϲ in Delphi (19/20). εὐμενεῖ νόωι underscores the sudden emotional shift effectively, the more so since it qualifies the attitude of Apollo, the same god who has just been referred to as a killer of monsters. For Pindar's deliberate variations of mood, see introduction pp. 45-7. The two-sidedness of Apollo, implied in this juxtaposition, ties in with quite a few similar portrayals of two-sided personalities in this ode: Hesychia's soft and harsh side (6-12), Alcmaeon's warlike and friendly side (45-7, 56-60), the δαίμων's two-sidedness (76-8). See further interpretation, pp. 441/2, 448, 453.

For the expression cf. Λατόοϲ ἔνθα με παῖδεϲ | εὐμενεῖ δέξαϲθε νόωι, *Pae.*5.44/5. Cf. also αἰτέω ϲε ..., ὦ ἄνα, | ἵλαοϲ ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε ϲὺν εὐμενίαι | δέξαι ϲτεφάνωμα τόδ' ἐκ Πυθῶνοϲ εὐδόξωι Μίδαι | αὐτόν τε νιν Ἑλλάδα νικάϲαντα, *P.*12.1-6; ϲὺν δὲ φιλοφροϲύναιϲ εὐηράτοιϲ Ἁγηϲία δέξαιτο κῶμον, *O.*6.98; καρδίαι γελανεῖ | ... δέκευ, *O.*5.2/3; εὔφρων δέξεται, *P.*9.73; οὐ βοῶν πάρεϲτι ϲώματ', οὔτε χρυϲόϲ, οὔτε πορφύρεοι τάπητεϲ, ἀλλὰ θυμὸϲ εὐμενήϲ, | Μοῦϲά τε γλυκεῖα, καὶ Βοιωτίοιϲιν ἐκ ϲκύφοιϲιν οἶνοϲ ἡδύϲ, B.*fr.*21. For Apollo's 'favourable reception' of a κῶμοϲ cf. also ἵλεῴι νιν ὁ Δα[λ]ογενὴϲ υἱὸϲ βαθυζώνο[ιο] Λατοῦϲ | δέκτ[ο] βλεφά[ρω]ι, B.11.15-7.

19. Ξενάρκειον

Pindar's penchant for adjectives derived from proper names, as an alternative for a genitive,[39] is noteworthy. The use of such adjectives is a feature of epic diction.[40] In the case of traditional names, the adjectives are in fact borrowed from epic (with slight dialectical variations): cὺν Ἀγαμεμνονίαι | ψυχᾶι, *P.*11.20/1 (cf. νῆ' Ἀγαμεμνονέην, *Il.*10.326; Ἀγαμεμνονέην ἄλοχον, *Od.*3.264, etc.); Νεcτόρειον ... ἅρμα, *P.*6.32 (cf. Νεcτορέηι παρὰ νηΐ, *Il.*2.54; Νεcτορέαc ... ἵππουc, *Il.*8.113; ἀcπίδα Νεcτορέην, *ibid.*192). Cf. also adjectives derived from names of deities: ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέαc, *O.*2.12 (cf. A.*Pr.*577; Homer has Κρονίων [*Il.*1.528, etc.]); Ποcειδανίοιcιν ἵπποιc, *O.*5.21; Ποcειδάνιον | ... Κτέατον, *O.*10.26/7 (cf. B.*fr.*6, S.*OC* 1494; Homer has Ποcιδήιοc [*Il.*2.506]). The adjective in ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίcια, *N.*7.53, does not occur in Homer, but cf. ἔργον Ἀφροδίcιον, Semon.7.48 W.; S.*fr.*166, Pl.*Smp.*183b, etc. The adjective in Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα, *P.*5.23; Ἀπολλωνίαιc ἀλεξιμβρότοιc ... πομπαῖc, *P.*5.90; Ἀπολλωνίαι ... νάπαι, *P.*6.9, is not Homeric either, but cf. E.*Or.*1388. The adjective in φύcιν Ὠαριωνείαν, *I.*4.49, is not attested elsewhere.

The coinage of such an adjective from the name of a living person is a bold extension of this usage. The only other Pindaric example is ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, *P.*2.18. Bacchylides has Ἀριcτομένειον | ... τέκοc, 6.12/3; cf. 7.10/1.

Also outside Pindar and Bacchylides examples of an adjective coined from a proper name not referring to a deity or hero[41] are few and far between: ἁ Βερενικεία θυγάτηρ, Theoc.15.110 (the section of the *Idylle* in which it occurs is 'epic' to the extent that it is a performance of an ἀοιδόc; moreover, Berenice's deification has been alluded to in the preceding context, 106/7); ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κλεινίειοc οὗτοc ἄλλοτε ἄλλων ἐcτὶ λόγων, Pl.*Grg.*482a, which is said with a tone of poetic persiflage;[42] the same may be true for δῶρον Νικιάαc εἰc ἀλόχω χέρραc ὀπάccομεν, Theoc.28.9. Cf. further ἐν τῆιδε τῆι πληcίον τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου οἰκίαι τῆι Μορυχίαι, Pl.*Phaedr.*227b; Γοργίειοc, X.*Smp.*2.26, D.H.*Dem.*5; Plut.*Alc.*14, *IG* 12.2.96, etc.

---

[39] It must be observed that in our passage here, the word order being as it is, a genitive would be rather awkward, because a listening audience could be tempted to take it in the first instance with εὐμενεῖ νόωι.

[40] The use of adjectives derived from proper names is traditionally regarded as a dialectical feature, either Aeolic or Boeotic (see, e.g., Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, pp. 134/5, 147; Gildersleeve, pp. xc/xci; Van Leeuwen on *O.*2.12 [I, pp. 62/3] with the references cited in n. 127 [II, p. 423]). See also Gow on Theoc.28.9 (II, pp. 498/9) and Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 137/8 (§ 147), with further references.

[41] Further examples of adjectives from traditional names include: *Il.*2.20, 5.108, 11.562, A.*Ag.*1499 (with Fraenkel *ad loc.*), *Pr.*705, S.*OT* 267, *Aj.*134, E.*Med.*404, *IT* 5, *Hel.*133, *Or.*1154, Theoc.22.5, 31, 207, 26.36, Call.*H.*2.87, 3.83, etc. For further examples see also Kühner-Gerth, II 1, pp. 261/2 (§ 402).

[42] Cf. Gildersleeve, p. xci.

On a basic level, the use of such adjectives instead of genitives shares with many features of Pindar's language the objective of being unusual, widening the gap that sets off Pindar's language from every day speech. The epic connotations, which this procedure of word formation evokes, are especially marked in the case of non-epic names, to the extent that the person referred to by the adjective is associated with the realm of epic heroes.

19-20. ἔδεκτο Κίρραθεν ἐcτεφανωμένον | υἱὸν ποίαι Παρναccίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμωι

Apollo 'received' the victor 'from Cirrha crowned with Parnassian grass and a Dorian κῶμοc.' As Heath has shown in *AJPh* 109, 1988, 180-195, the **κῶμοc** evokes associations with the revelry after a symposium: "When suitably inebriated the revellers at a party would set out, wearing their garlands, singing songs to the accompaniment of αὐλοί, and lighting their way with torches; and they would make their way to the house of some friend, there to seek admission" (p. 180). Here the reference to the victor's crown conjures up the garlands of the revellers setting out from a symposium. "The arrival of such an unruly mob at one's door might well prove troublesome. The question whether the κῶμοc would be given a cordial reception was accordingly crucial; and for this **δέχεcθαι** becomes almost a technical term in komastic literature" (p. 180).[43] In our passage Apollo is said to have 'received' the κῶμοc. What are the precise implications of this statement?

In Pindar, as in the works of other epinician poets for that matter, references are being made to epinician κῶμοι. In some passages it is clear that κῶμοc refers to impromptu celebrations on the scene of the victory.

Cf. especially τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλοc | φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικοc ὁ τριπλόοc κεχλαδώc, | ἄρεcκε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἁγεμονεῦcαι | κωμάζοντι φίλοιc Ἐφαρμόcτωι cὺν ἑταίροιc, *O*.9.1-4. In καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτεc ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι | οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θραcύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, | οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν, *I*.2.30-2, apparently, a distinction is made between κῶμοι and ἀοιδαί, the latter including Pindar's present ode (as it is hinted at by the following lines); this leads one to suspect that κώμων here refers to unofficial celebrations, together with ἀοιδαί symbolizing the joy of victory.

However, Pindar refers on several occasions to his *own* ode as 'this κῶμοc.' See my note on line 70 below (pp. 561-6). Here, however, the past reference of ἔδεκτο makes clear unequivocally that Pindar is

---

[43] The passages referring to receiving a sympotiatic κῶμοc discussed by Heath (pp. 180-2) include Pl.*Smp*.212c-4a, 223b, Eubulus *fr*.94 K, Thgn.1041/2, 1045/6, Alc.374 L.-P., Theocr.2.118-24.

referring to the impromptu celebration at the scene of the victory[44] (cf. lines 61-5 below, where the victory is referred to in the past; τόθι, 64, makes clear that the present performance was in Aegina; contrast line 70 below where the present reference of παρέςτακε makes clear that there κῶμος is used in the metaphorical sense, referring to the choral performance of the present ode; see my note, pp. 561-5: then, back in Delphi, Apollo, in his capacity of the patron of the games, 'received' the κῶμος that came from the plain of Cirrha up to Apollo's home on the mountain. In Pindar's time the athletic competitions, as well as the equestian events, were held in the plain of Cirrha below at the sea, not in Delphi itself. Only in the second half of the fifth century were the athletics transferred to the new stadium, constructed above the precinct of Apollo (Paus.10.32.1, 37.4). The horse-race continued to be held in the Crisean plain.[45] As goes forth from Bacchylides' fourth ode, it was not uncustomary for the victors in Cirrha to go up to Delphi for the celebrations: ἀγχιάλοιcι Κ̣[ί]ρραc μυχοῖc | μοῦνον ἐπιχθονίω̣ν τάδε μηcάμενον cτεφάνοιc ἐρέ̣πτειν, B.4.14-6: "Die 'meernahen Winkel von Kirrha' ... entsprechen der Ortsangabe in 4 παρ' [ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονόc, freilich mit dem Unterschied, daß die Siegesfeier (5 Πυ[θ]ιόνικοc ἀ[είδε]ται) oben im Heiligtum stattfindet, während der Wettkampf selbst unten in der Ebene bei Kirrha abgehalten wurde" (Maehler *ad loc.*, II, p. 75). This gives us a real κῶμοc, in the sense of 'procession,' from Cirrha to Delphi. The 'ablative' value of Κίρραθεν adds to the picture of Apollo receiving the κῶμοc 'coming from Cirrha'; the reference to the victor's crown in this particular connection adds to the vividness of the picture, in that it helps to conjure up the occasion before the eyes of the audience, and it may evoke connotations of the garlands worn by the revellers setting out from a feast.[46]

The poet's reporting Apollo's reception of the victor at the scene of the victory in the context of a κῶμοc is paralleled by: ἵλεῴι νιν ὁ Δα[λ̣]ογενὴc

[44] Thus Heath, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

[45] See Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, p. 212; Daremberg-Saglio IV i, p. 787b; Giannini on *P.*5.36-9 (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 522/3; further references are to be found therein). Cf. also τῶι μὲν διδύμαc χάριταc | εἰ κατέβαν ὑγίειαν ἄγων χρυcέαν κῶμον τ' ἀέθλων Πυθίων αἴγλαν cτεφάνοιc, | τοὺc ἀριcτεύων Φερένικοc ἕλεν Κίρραι ποτέ, *P.*3.72-4; εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν | Κριcαίαιc ἐνὶ πτυχαῖc ἀπαγγελεῖ, *P.*6.17/8; ἐν Κρίcαι δ' εὐρυcθενὴc εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν, *I.*2.18; *P.*5.37, *P.*7.12, *P.*10.15, *P.*11.12.

[46] Cf. Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, p. 152. For Pindar's taking the audience in fancy back to the place of victory, which has the effect of recapturing the excitement of the celebration immediately after victory, cf. the proems of *O.*9 and *N.*9, cited in my note on 71 below, pp. 562/3. See esp. Carey, *Tria Lustra*.

υἱὸς βαθυζώνο[ιο] Λατοῦς | δέκτ[ο] βλεφά[ρω]ι· πολέες δ' ἀμφ' Ἀλεξ[ίδα]μον ἀνθέων | ἐν πεδίωι στέφανοι Κίρρας ἔπεσον κρατερᾶς ἦρα παννίκοι⟨ο⟩ πάλας· | οὔκ ε[ἶ]δέ νιν ἀέλιος | κείνωι γε σὺν ἄματι πρὸς γαίαι πεσόντα, B.11.15-23, where κείνωι γε σὺν ἄματι (23) and the contrast with καὶ νῦν in 10 make clear unequivocally that the reference is to a past κῶμος. The κῶμος symbolizes the victory itself (cf. B.10.30/1).

The κῶμος is '**Dorian**,' which must mean that it is Aeginetan (see my note on *N.*3.3, pp. 246/7), which, taken literally, implies the presence of a contingent of Aeginetans at the scene of the victory. Even nowadays traveling from Aegina to Delphi is no sinecure, most Aeginetans in Pindar's times would neither have the resources nor the vacation to undertake such a voyage in order to support Aristomenes, so probably one should not overestimate the number of Aeginetans present at the scene of the victory. But probably a hand full of relatives and friends could qualify as a κῶμος. Cf. κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστωι σὺν ἑταίροις, *O.*9.4. The emphatic qualification of the impromptu κῶμος as 'Dorian,' i.e., Aeginetan, could have the effect of associating that unofficial celebration in Delphi with the present choral performance in Aegina. If one wishes to see an intended effect in the fact that in 70 below the same noun is used metaphorically for the choral performance of the present ode, one could describe the function of this echo in terms of presenting the current performance as a re-enactment of the real κῶμος from Cirrha to Delphi. Such a representation of this performance as a re-enactment of the spontaneous outburstings of joy at the scene of the victory would tie in neatly with Pindar's general tendency towards spontaneity.

ποία is a collective term referring to all kinds of 'greenery,' including grass (*Od.*18.372), plants, leaves or even flowers (*Il.*14.347-9, cf. also *P.*9.37 of the flower of virginity). See Braswell on *P.*4.240 (p. 328). Here the ποία **Παρνασσίς** is of course laurel (cf. Plin.*NH* 15.134); for more details see Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. xxvi (further references are to be found therein). For reference to mount Parnassus in order to identify the site of the victory as Delphi, cf. *O.*13.106, *P.*10.8, *N.*2.19, etc. For the phrase cf. στεφάνοισι ... ποίας, *P.*4.240; ἀνθέων ποιάεντα ... στεφανώματα, *N.*5.54.

•*Aspect:* The verbal aspect of ἔδεκτο ties in with the poet's fictional presentation of 18-20 as if it were a mere afterthought: the poet pretends that the κῶμος leaps to his mind as an association occasioned by Apollo whom he has just mentioned (see my note on ὅς above, p. 498). On the level of the extemporizing fiction, the relative clause (18-20) provides background information to the preceding statement, in which case the imperfect is the obvious choice.

• *Zeugma:* ἐστεφανωμένον | ... ποίαι Παρνασσίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμωι is semantically zeugmatic, to the extent that the verb ἐστεφανωμένον is used literally with the first dative adjunct (ποίαι Παρνασσίδι), whereas it has a metaphorical sense with the second (Δωριεῖ κώμωι). The effect of zeugma is comparable to that of syntactical assymmetry (see introduction, pp. 51/2). The effect is twofold. Zeugma is both a styl-

ized imitation of the unpremeditated structures of ex tempore speech, and an example of Pindar exerting himself to avoid the obvious. It ties in both with his concern for creating the illusion of spontaneity (on the level of the fiction of the poet creating his text spontaneously on the very spot), and (on the level of the poet who actually composes his texts with great skill, carefully calculation their effects upon his audience) with his general tendency towards being unpredictable and, by making high demands upon the concentration of his audience, hightening their attentiveness and their active involvement in the performance.

Other examples of zeugma in Pindar include: (syntactic and semantic zeugma:) ἕλεν δ' Οἰνομάου βίαν παρθένον τε cύνευνον (*sc.* Pelops), *O.*1.88; ἐθελήcαιc ταῦτα νόωι τιθέμεν εὔανδρόν τε χώραν, *P.*1.40; (semantic zeugma:) ἐκράτηcε ... Ἕλλανα cτρατὸν Πυθῶνι, ... | καὶ τὸν Ἰcθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέαι cτέφανον, *N.*10.25/6, where, like *h.l.*, the verb is literal with the first complement, and metaphorical with the second; δῶρα καὶ κράτοc ἐξέφαναν ἐγγενὲc αὐτῶι, *N.*4.68. See further Kühner-Gerth, II, p. 571; E. Bruhn, *Anhang* (to Schneidewin-Nauck) *Sophokles*, Berlin 1899, pp. 113/4; D. Fehling, *Die Wederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin 1969, pp. 278/9; Gerber on *O.*1.88 (pp. 136/7); Braswell on *P.*4.18 (p. 87), who rightly insists that for some passages "the need to supply another verb is felt not so much in the original language as in that into which they are to be translated" (a consideration that withholds me from listing *P.*4.18, 251/2, *O.*13.20-2 here); and who rightly distinguishes zeugma from different cases of brachylogy like οὔτε ἔργον | οὔτ' ἔποc ... εἰπών, *P.*4.104/5.

Strophe B

21-28

It did not fall far from the Graces, the island with her righteous city, touching the renowned achievements of the Aeacids. It has a perfect reputation from the beginning. For it is sung about as having raised heroes superior in many price winning games and in swift battles. Moreover, it stands out also from men.

21. ἔπεcε δ' οὐ Χαρίτων ἑκάc

Aegina 'fell not far from the Graces.' By means of litotes Aegina is closely associated with the Graces (contrast: ἄνευ οἱ Χαρίτων τέκεν γόνον ὑπερφίαλον, *P.*2.42; for litotes see my note on *N.*3.76, pp. 393/4). The Graces are responsible for all beauty and pleasure, on earth and among the gods (*O.*14.3-12, cf. also *O.*9.27, *O.*1.30; see my note on *N.*5.54, p. 193). Thus, this line poetically states that Aegina is a beautiful and pleasant island. Cf. χρὴ δ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοιcι Θήβαιc τραφέντα | Αἰγίναι Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν, *I.*8.16/16a. As goddesses

of beauty, the Graces are often associated with poetry (cf., e.g., ἀοίδιμοι βαcίλειαι | Χάριτες, *O.*14.3/4; *P.*9.1-3, *N.*9.54). The association with song becomes functional in 25-7, where it is said that Aegina is the subject of many songs of praise.

Burton says "it is generally agreed that the metaphor in ἔπεcε is from the fall of dice" (*Pythian Odes*, p. 180).[47] Thus the beauty of Aegina would be presented as a whim of fate. However, the collocation with ἕκαc does not help to evoke this association, for in a game of dice it is not really relevant *where* the dice fall. The verb πίτνειν with a local qualification (frequently with ἐν) is a favourite expression of Pindar's for 'fall into, find oneself,' referring the occurrence of a certain situation to a person from the point of view of this person. No specific image seems to be implied here. See further my note on *N.*5.42 (p. 171).

22-24. ἁ δικαιόπολιc ἀρεταῖc | κλειναῖcιν Αἰακιδᾶν | θιγοῖcα νᾶcoc 'The island with just cities that touches the renowned achievements of the Aeacids,' i.e., Aegina. It is remarkable that Aegina is not mentioned by name. Explicit reference to the victor's place of origin is a requirement of the genre. In this ode this requirement is fulfilled not before 98. On the other hand, 'the island of the Aeacids' is quite unambiguous as a reference to Aegina, probably also for non-Aeginetans. The notion δίκα plays a crucial role in this ode (cf. lines 2, 72). Lines 21-28 imply a correlation between adherance to δίκα and glory; moreover it is implied that there is a connection between δίκα and the Aeacids. For the relevance of these points see interpretation, pp. 434/5. For the 'touching' metaphor see my note on *N.*5.42 ἔψαυcαc (p. 172) and introduction pp. 30-2. For ἀρεταί see my note on *N.*5.53 (pp. 188-90).

For the association of Aegina with δίκα, cf. Αἰακιδᾶν | ἠύπυργον ἕδοc, δίκαι ξεναρκέι κοινὸν | φέγγοc, *N.*4.11-3. Cf. also: ἔνθα (*sc.* in Aegina) cώτειρα Διὸc ξενίου | πάρεδροc ἀcκεῖται Θέμιc | ἔξοχ' ἀνθρώπων, *O.*8.21-3; εὔνομον πόλιν, *I.*5.22 (cf. Privitera *ad loc.*, p. 193). For the verbal correspondence between δικαιόπολιc and μεγιcτόπολι (2), see interpretation, p. 435. Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentile *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 569) draws attention to the rhyme of ἑκάc and Δίκαc (1), in the same metrical position; this rhyme may help to underscore the functional correspondence between δικαιόπολιc and μεγιcτόπολι. C. Bailey, 'Who Played Dikaiopolis', *Greek Poetry and Life*, Oxford 1936, suggested that Aristophanes named his Dikaiopolis after this occurrence of the word in this poem; that is probably false.

---

[47] Thus Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 70), Farnell *ad loc.* (II, p. 194), Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 301), Giannini *ad loc* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 569).

24-25. τελέαν δ' ἔχει | δόξαν ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς

Aegina 'has a perfect renown from the beginning' of its existence. ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς refers to Aeacus, Aegina's founding father, who was an emblem of righteousness. Notwithstanding the fact that ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς is thus historically justified, it is a quite remarkable compliment.[48] Within the frame-work of archaic thought δόξα tends to be something one has to earn. Although the capacities to do so may be inborn, one has to give proof of possessing them, by displaying them, in order to acquire δόξα. If ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς refers to the beginning of the Aeginetan line as represented by Aeacus' entire life, which was certainly full of δόξα, the suggestion that his δόξα has been preserved in its perfect state, an idea that is elaborated upon in the next lines, entails a veiled justification of the Aeginetan aristocratic concepts, in that the suggestion is conveyed that there is a correspondence between Aegina's perfect δόξα and continuation of Aeacus' principles as represented by the old elite which traced their lineage back to him.

The adjective **τέλεος**/τέλειος associates the noun it qualifies with its natural τέλος. Thus τέλεαι εὐχωλαί (*fr.*122.19/20; cf. *P.*9.89, A.*Th.*832, Ar.*Th.*353, Hdt.1.121, etc.) are 'prayers that are fulfilled,' since fulfilment is the τέλος of prayers. Thus, the eagle is τελειότατον πετεηνῶν (*Il.*8.247, 24.315), because it is the most reliable omen, which is very likely to be fulfilled. Slightly differently, Zeus can be qualified as τέλειος (*O.*13.115, *P.*1.67, A.*Ag.*1432, *Th.*167, etc.; also Hera, *N.*10.18, by association with her husband or as goddess of marriage [cf. LSJ *s.v.* τέλος, I.6]), because the τέλος of everything is in Zeus' hands (τέλος μὲν Ζεὺς ἔχει βαρύκτυπος | πάντων ὅς' ἐστι, Sem.1.1/2 W.). When qualifying nouns that do not have a natural τέλος, the adjective imparts that what the noun refers to is the perfect specimen of its sort. Thus, in Homer the adjective is used as a qualification of victims that are 'without spot or blemish' (*Il.*1.66, 24.34; cf. also *Il.*1.315, *Od.*4.352). Also of persons, as in τὸν Πᾶνα χορευτὰν τελεώτατον θεῶν ὄντα, ὡς Πίνδαρος ὑμνεῖ, *fr.*99. For the adjective qualifying abstract notions, cf., e.g., αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀρετὴ μέν ἐστι τέλεια ... καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλάκις κρατίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν εἶναι δοκεῖ ἡ δικαιοσύνη, Arist.*EN* 1129b25-30; cf. *ibid.* 1129b25-30, etc. For τελέα δόξα, cf. ἀνείρονα δόξαν, *P.*2.62; κλέος βαθύ, *O.*7.52; εὐρὺ κλέος, *O.*10.95.

For the pun on 'beginning' and 'end,' cf. τοῦτ' ἔργον βασιλεύς, | ὅστις ἄρχει ναός, ἐμοὶ τελέσαις, *P.*4.229/30; Φοίβου ἀκούσαντες Πυθωνόθεν οἴκαδ' ἔνεικαν | μαντείας τε θεοῦ καὶ τελέεντ' ἔπεα· | ἄρχειν μὲν βουλῆς θεοτιμήτους βασιλῆας, Tyrt.*fr.*4.1-3 W.; perhaps also: ὑστέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων | τέλλεται, *O.*11.5/6.

---

[48] Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 569) draws attention to the fact that the history of the Aeacids is not without blemishes, witnessing Peleus' and Telamon's murder of Phocus (*N.*5.14 ff.) and Neoptolemus' unholy killing of Priam (*Pae.*6.111 ff.).

25-27. πολλοῖcι μὲν γὰρ ἀείδεται | νικαφόροιc ἐν ἀέθλοιc θρέψαιcα καὶ θοαῖc | ὑπερτάτουc ἥρωαc ἐν μάχαιc

'For it (Aegina) is sung about as having raised heroes superior in many price winning games and in swift battles.' The two coordinated ἐν clauses are governed by ὑπερτάτουc (ἥρωαc). For 'height' as an image for superiority see my note on line 77 below (p. 575). Excelling both in games and in war is a familiar *topos* of praise. Cf. *O.*2.43-5; *N.*1.16-8, *I.*1.47-51; cf. also *N.*5.19 with my note *ad loc.* (p. 128). The successful warriors Aegina has raised surely include Aeacus and his stock. Those who sing about them surely include Homer and those performing Homer's works up to Pindar's time (cf. *N.*2.1-2, *I.*4.41-5). The idea of Aegina being sung about because of the martial achievements of the heroes it has raised, is elaborated in more detail in *I.*5.26-9, 34-6, 43/4, and in *N.*6.45-54; cf. also *I.*6.19-30. For the martial prowess of the Aeacids cf. also *I.*8.25/6, *N.*3.32-64, Hes.*fr.*203, 206 M.-W. For athletic successes of the Aeacids cf. *Il.*23.708-39, 811-25, Apollod.3.12.6, Hyg.*Fab.*273, Σ. *Hyp. Pyth.* a (II, 3 Dr.).

• *Coordination:* **γάρ** marks that what follows (25-8 as a whole) serves as a justification for the preceding assertion that Aegina has a perfect renown from the very beginning. **μέν** raises the espectancy that 25-7 will be followed by another statement under the scope of γάρ. This expectancy is fulfilled by line 28, which is marked by τά δέ correlating with μέν: what is said in 25-7 about Aegina's heroes is true also for its men. It is worth noting that the two contrasting *topics*, ἥρωαc and ἀνδράcιν, are not linguistically marked as such (cf. Gildersleeve *ad loc.*, p. 329). As a rule, the marked position directly before μέν is reserved for the *topic* of the first clause, the contrasting *topic* of the second clause then taking the marked position directly before δέ.[49] Here there is no signal for the audience to anticipate that ἥρωαc is the *topic* that is to be followed by a contrasting *topic*. **καί** in 28, in underscoring the parallelism between the men and the heroes, retrospectively brings this structure to light.

• *Word Order:* This sentence (25-7) is characterized by a high degree of syntactical tension (see introduction, pp. 50/1). Only with the very last word the sentence has reached the point in which it could theoratically be (and in fact is) syntactically complete. Pindar's concern for ποικιλία is visible also on the level of syntactical tension, in that this long, complex sentence is both preceded and followed by short, syntactically straightforward sentences.

---

[49] The first sentences of X.*An*1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are classic examples of this device. See further Bakker, *Studies in Language* 17, 1993, 275-311, esp. 282-4; Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 13. See also my *CPh* 89, 1994, 314.

The adjective **θοός**, 'swift,' (cf. ἅρμα θοόν, *O.*8.49, *O.*1.110; ἵππους θοάς, *P.*4.17; cf. *fr.*89a.3, *P.*11.48; θοαὶ νᾶες, *O.*12.3, *O.*6.101, *P.*4.25, *P.*5.87, *N.*7.28) is in the *Iliad* a common epithet of Ares and warriors. Cf. Ἄρηϊ θοῶι, *Il.*5.430; cf. 8.215, 13.295, 328, 528, 16.784, 17.72, 536. It is a positive qualification: Αἰνείας δ' οὐ μεῖνε, θοός περ ἐὼν πολεμιστής, 5.570; αἰδώς, ὦ Λύκιοι, πόσε φεύγετε; νῦν θοοὶ ἔστε, 16.442 (or ἐστέ, indic., which would be a sarcasm; cf. Leaf *ad loc.*, Ebeling *s.v.* θοός); ἐπεὶ θοὸς ἔσκε μετὰ πρώτοισι μάχεσθαι, 5.536. Cf. also ἐφορμαθεὶς δ' ἄρ' ἄκοντι θοῶι, *N.*10.69 (cf. *N.*7.72). The epic connotations of the adjective ('collocative meaning') help to conjure up the days of old in which the superior heroes referred to here excelled.

For **τρέφω** with a subject referring to a location, cf. *P.*1.17, *P.*9.88, *N.*2.13, *I.*8.40, *fr.*70.3, *fr.*156. For **νικαφόρος**, cf. *O.*2.5, 13.14, *N.*1.7, 3.67, *I.*1.22; cf. also *O.*1.115.

Antistrophe B

28. τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἐμπρέπει

ἀνδράσιν refers to the men of the 'post-mythical' age (as opposed to ἥρωας, 27, in keeping with the destinctions made, e.g., in *O.*2.2). Aegina 'stands out' also from them, i.e., not only Aegina's heroes are excellent and famous, its men, too, are pre-eminent. 'Aegina stand out from men' is brachylogy for 'Aegina's men are pre-eminent among their contemporaries.'

The reference to the Aeginetans of to-day emphalically includes the present victor, Aristomenes. He and his fellow Aeginetans prove to possess the same prowess as their mythical ancestors, the Aeacids (mentioned again briefly at the very end of the ode, in lines 99/100). Pindar frequently insists that abilities are innate and inherited (cf. *N.*3.40-2, further passages are quoted in my note *ad loc*, pp. 324-8) and he often implied that the qualities of mythical ancestors live on in the victor. Nonetheless, the explicitness of this passage is striking. In many odes, what is explicitly stated here, is merely implied, by implicit and suggestive juxtaposition of myths and the victory. Moreover, the collective application of the idea in this passage is noteworthy. The idea of qualities being inherited from the ancestors is not focussed on the person of the victor, but applied to the entire Aeginetan people.

The verb **ἐμπρέπω** (only *h.l.* in Pindar) means 'standing out' from a background, describing something that is conspicuous against its surroundings. The dative complement to the verb refers to these backgrounds or surroundings.[50]

---

[50] Thus also Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 570). Most commentators

Cf. νῦν δὲ Λύδαιcιν ἐμπρέπεται γυναίκεcciν ὥc ποτ' ἀελίω | δύντοc ἀ βροδοδάκτυλοc †μήνα | πάντα περ⟨ρ⟩έχοιc' ἄcτρα, Sapph.*fr.*96.6-9 V.; πενταέθλοιcιν γὰρ ἐνέπρεπεν ὡc ἄcτρων διακρίνει φάη | νυκτὸc διχομήνιδο[c] εὐφεγγὴc cελάνα, B.8.27/8; ἐμπρέποντac αἰθέρι | ἀcτέραc, A.*Ag.*6/7; Βάκχαιc ... ἐμπρέπων | κωμαcτὴc Διόνυcoc, Ar.*Nu.*605/6. Cf. also λίβοc ἐπ' ὀμμάτων αἵματοc ἐμπρέπει, A.*Ag.*1428, etc. For πρέπω, 'to stand out from a background,' see my note on *N.*3.67 (pp. 376/7).

For adverbial **τὰ δέ** cf. οἷον δ' ἐν Μαραθῶνι ... | μένεν ἀγῶνα πρεcβυτέρων ...· | φῶταc δ' ὀξυρεπεῖ δόλωι | ἀπτωτὶ δαμάccαιc | διήρχετο κύκλον ὅccαι βοᾶι, ὡραῖοc ἐὼν καὶ καλὸc κάλλιcτά τε ῥέξαιc. | τὰ δὲ Παρναccίωι cτρατῶι | θαυμαcτὸc ἐὼν φάνη κτλ, *O.*9.89-96, 'In Marathon ...; then again, at another occasion, in Delphi ...'; similarly: ἐν βάccαιcιν Ἰcθμοῦ δεξαμένωι cτεφάνουc, τὰ δὲ κοίλαι λέοντοc | ἐν βαθυcτέρνου νάπαι κάρυξε Θήβαν | ἱπποδρομίαι κρατέων, *I.*3.11-3; οὐ ψεύcομ' ἀμφὶ Κορίνθωι, Cίcυφον μὲν πυκνότατον παλάμαιc ὡc θεόν, | καὶ τὰν πατρὸc ἀντία Μήδειαν θεμέναν γάμον αὐτᾶι, | ναΐ cώτειραν Ἀργοῖ καὶ προπόλοιc· | τὰ δὲ καί ποτ' ἐν ἀλκᾶι | πρὸ Δαρδάνου τειχέων ἐδόκηcαν | ἐπ' ἀμφότερα μαχᾶν τάμνειν τέλοc, *O.*13.52-7, 'then again, another example, the Trojan war.' For τὰ μέν see my note on *N.*3.43 (pp. 336/7). For **καί** see preceding note.

29-34

I lack leasure to set up the whole long story with my lyre and my gentle voice, lest satiety come and irritate. What lies at my feet, my debt to you, boy, the newest of your splendours, must go forth running, winged by my skill.

29-34

For the function of the break-off passage and Pindar's manipulation of the expectancies on the part of his audience, see interpretation, p. 435.

29. εἰμὶ δ' ἄcχολοc ἀναθέμενεν | πᾶcαν μακραγορίαν

'I am without leasure to set up the whole long story.' The preceding references to the glory of Aegina's heroes and men give rise to an elaboration in which their deeds are related in order to substantiate the claim. However, Pindar's ἀcχολία, 'obligations,' prevent him from giving this whole μακραγορία. These obligations are his encomastic duties in their narrowest sense, to praise the present victor, as the following lines specify (32-4). The rejection of the μακραγορία in terms of 'lack of leasure' is elegant because it conveys the suggestion that it would in itself be a great pleasure for Pindar to give a full account of all the glorious deeds of the Aeginetans. Moreover, πᾶcαν

---

take ἀνδράcιν as a causal dative ('Aegina is pre-eminent for its men'), which gives the same general meaning.

μακραγορίαν suggests that Aegina's successes are very plenty; μή κόρος ἐλθὼν κνίσῃ (32) specifies that they are in fact too plentiful to be narrated in detail, which is a compliment to Aegina.

For Pindar referring to the professional aspects of his profession in terms of **ἀσχολία** cf. *I.*1.1-6. Cf. also ἀλλὰ χαλκὸν μυρίον οὐ δυνατὸν | ἐξελέγχειν — μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆσαι σχολᾶς — | ὅν τε Κλείτωρ καὶ Τεγέα καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ὑψίβατοι πόλιες | καὶ Λύκαιον παρ Διὸς θῆκε δρόμωι, *N.*10.45-8. For reference to the 'length' of the story by means of **μακρός** or related expressions, cf. *O.*13.40ff., *P.*1.81ff., *P.*9.76ff., *I.*1.62ff.; thus with reference to mythological stories in *P.*4.247, *N.*4.33ff., *N.*7.50ff., *N.*10.19ff. Other break off passages of the type 'too much to tell' include: *O.*2.83ff., *I.*6.56, etc. See further Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 51/2 with nn. 13, 15.

• *Semantics:* The verb **ἀνατίθημι** evokes connotations of 'setting up' votif gifts or inscriptions. Thus the summing up of all the glorious deeds of the Aeginetans is implicitly compared to a lengthy inscription, comparable, e.g., to the inscription in Megara bearing the names of the victors (ἐν Μεγάροισί τ' οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα | ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον, *O.*7.86/7).[51] The combination of πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν with these connotations of a lengthy inscription make it easy to imagine that such a summing up would lead to a tedious result (such a means of composition is explicitly rejected in passages like *P.*1.81/2, *P.*9.76-9, *P.*10.53/4, *P.*11.41/2). There is an implied contrast with 32-4.[52] It is tempting to compare this contrast between static monuments and movable song to the opening lines of *N.*5.

For the verb referring to 'setting up' votif gifts or inscriptions cf., e.g., ἔλαφον ..., ἅν ποτε Ταϋγέτα | ἀντιθεῖς' Ὀρθωσίας ἔγραψεν ἱεράν, *O.*3.29/30; ἔνθα μέ φημι | ὕμνωι νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' οὐατόεντα. | τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσῃς Ἑλικωνιάδεσς' ἀνέθηκα, | ἔνθα με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς, Hes.*Op.*656-9; Hdt.2.159, 7.54, Ar.*Pl.*1089, etc.

The noun **μακραγορία** occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. But cf. Poll.2.121. For the verb cf., e.g., μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰδόσιν οὐ βουλόμενος ἐάσω, Th.2.36; (Κη.) Ἔρις περαίνει μῦθον ὑστάτη θεῶν. | (Αντ.) ἐγὼ δὲ θάψω τόνδε. μὴ μακραγόρει, A.*Th.*1051/2; (Φα.) ἦ γὰρ δίκαια ταῦτα κἀξαρκοῦντά μοι, | τρώσασαν ἥμας εἶτα συγχωρεῖν λόγοις; | (Τρ.) μακρηγοροῦμεν· οὐκ ἐσωφρόνουν ἐγώ, E.*Hipp.*702-4; Th.1.68. For the adjective μακρήγορος cf. Ph.2.268, Tz.*H.*10.4. Cf. also τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμὸς | ὧραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι, *N.*4.33/4; ἐμοὶ δὲ μακρὸν πάσας ⟨ἀν⟩αγήσασθ' ἀρετάς, *I.*6.56, and the passages cited above.

• *Coordination and Word Order:* The particle **δ'** marks this break off as just another independent step in the sequence, as if it were on a par

---

[51] κατὰ τὰ Μέγαρα ἔθος ἐστὶ τῶν νικηφόρων τὰ ὀνόματα λίθοις ἐγκολάπτεσθαι, Σ. *ad loc.*

[52] Thus Schroeder *ad loc.*, p. 71.

with the preceding sentences, whereas it is in fact, as far as the content is concerned, a substantial inscision in the train of thought. See my introduction pp. 26-30. It is remarkable that the marked position directly before δ' is taken by the empty copula εἰμί, especially in the light of the inscision in the train of thought that occurs (see also my note on *N.*3.80, pp. 413/4). A reference to (πᾶcαν) μακραγορίαν, the new *topic*, in the postion before δ' would have been the more common thing to do from a structural and pragmatic point of view.[53] Here the word order seems to aim at a climactic effect, in that the word that is most significant and that adds most to the compliment to Aegina, μακραγορίαν, comes last.

31. λύραι τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῶι

For the combination of the lyre and singing voice cf. *N.*3.11/2 with my notes *ad loc.* (pp. 263-8). For μαλθακόc as a qualification of song see my note on line 6 above (pp. 474-6). τε καί (as opposed to just καί) tends to combine notions that are in reality compatible in a high degree, that represent, so to speak, two sides of the same picture. The lyre and the gentle voice together have reference to this current ode.

32. μὴ κόροc ἐλθὼν κνίcηι

'Lest satiety come and irritate.' The poet's assertion that his obligations are incompatible with giving a full account of the glorious deeds of the Aeginetans naturally implies the intention on the part of the poet not to do so; this final clause gives an additional motivation for the implied resolve.[54]

The noun **κόροc** denotes 'dissatisfaction with abundance.' This can go both ways, depending on whether the dissatisfaction arises from regarding abundance as excessive or as still not enough. Thus the noun may be used both for dissatisfaction arising from having too much of a thing, i.e., 'tedium, satiety,' and for dissatisfaction arising from having not enough of a thing while in fact having very much of it, i.e., 'insatiable desire, greed.' Typically, the former attitude is a reaction to the affluence of others (so that κόροc comes close to φθόνοc), while the latter concerns one's own affluence. The noun en-

[53] On the other hand, it must be observed that εἰμί, by virtue of being a first person form, serves as a signal indicating that the poet himself will be central to the sequel. In this respect the position of the verb may be functional from a structural and pragmatic point of view.

[54] In other words, μή motivates the speech act implied in εἰμὶ δ' ἄcχολοc κτλ., more than its content. Thus Gildersleeve *ad h.l.* (p. 329): "'I have no time' = 'I say that I have no time'."

tails a moral disqualification both ways. κόρος labels a person's wrong reaction to abundance.

In Pindar, when κόρος is used in the sense of dissatisfaction with the abundance of others, 'satiety, tedium,' it often refers to dissatisfaction of (unwilling elements in) Pindar's audience with the abundance of praise bestowed upon the victor. κόρος is a notoriously dangerous side-effect of encomistic poetry: too explicit or too lengthy praise is bound to cause envy and tedium on the part of the audience, so as to turn out counter-productive.

This idea is expressed in detail in: καιρὸν εἰ φθέγξαιο, πολλῶν πείρατα συντανύσαις | ἐν βραχεῖ, μείων ἕπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων· ἀπὸ γὰρ κόρος ἀμβλύνει | αἰανὴς ταχείας ἐλπίδας· | ἀστῶν δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει μάλιστ' ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις, *P.*1.81-4; κόρος is the audience's dissatisfaction with lengthy or exalted praise of the victor. πολλῶν πείρατα συντανύσαις | ἐν βραχεῖ defines the way in which κόρος can be avoided. If one wishes to praise someone, one should not present lengthy passages of exalted praise, but one should briefly touch upon many things, so that, in avoiding abundance, one avoids satiety. Cf. further: ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος | οὐ δίκαι συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, | τὸ λαλαγῆσαι θέλον κρυφὸν τιθέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς | ἔργοις, *O.*2.95-8.

Here κόρος has exactly these implications. The concept is adduced in order to motivate the break off of the type 'too much to tell'; the motivation resides in the idea that giving the πᾶσα μακραγορία would be counter-productive because such an abundance of praise would cause satiety and tedium.

Cf. βραχύ μοι στόμα πάντ' ἀναγήσασθ', ὅσων Ἀργεῖον ἔχει τέμενος | μοῖραν ἐσλῶν· ἔστι δὲ καὶ κόρος ἀνθρώπων βαρὺς ἀντιάσαι, *N.*10.19/20; Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διός τ' ἐκγόνων θρασύ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν | φαενναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων | οἴκοθεν· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαυσις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργωι· κόρον δ' ἔχει | καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίσια, *N.*7.50-3.

For κόρος referring to dissatisfaction with one's own abundance so as to want for even more, cf. ἀλλὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι | μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη (*sc.* Τάνταλος), κόρωι δ' ἕλεν | ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, *O.*1.55-7; καί τινα σὺν πλαγίωι | ἀνδρῶν κόρωι στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον | φᾶ ἑ δαιώσειν μόρον, *N.*1.64-6; Ὕβριν, Κόρου ματέρα θρασύμυθον, *O.*13.10 (see my note on 1/2 above, p. 569); οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἔπαλξις | πλούτου πρὸς κόρον ἀνδρὶ λακτίσαντι μέγαν Δίκας | βωμὸν εἰς ἀφάνειαν, A.*Ag.*381-4. One must be praised if one is not dissatified with one's own prosperity, so as not to want for more: εἴ τις ἀνδρῶν εὐτυχήσαις ἢ σὺν εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοις | ἢ σθένει πλούτου κατέχει φρασὶν αἰανῆ κόρον, | ἄξιος εὐλογίαις ἀστῶν μεμίχθαι, *I.*3.1-3.

For final **μή** with a subjunctive, cf. *P.*4.155, *Il.*1.522, 587, *Od.*6.147, etc. For **κνίζω** see my note on *N.*5.32 (p. 157). The mss. unanimously give the form κνίσηι here, as in *P.*11.23, where the mss. read ἔκνισεν. The mss. give the aorist ἔκνιξ- in *I.*5.58, *P.*10.60, and *I.*6.50. Schroeder normalizes to κνίξηι here and ἔκνιξεν in *P.*11.23, on the assumption that this is the

Doric aorist (cf. LSJ *s.v.*). The ι in ἔκνιc- is short, as it must be in *P.*11.23, whereas the ι in ἔκνιξ- is long (as it must be in *I.*5.58, and can be in *P.*10.60 and *I.*6.50). Here the ι takes the place of an anceps (the line scans —⏑⏑——×— ...), so that both forms would be metrically possible here. As the metre proves that Pindar used both ἔκνιc- and ἔκνιξ-, there is no basis for normalizing against the authority of the mss.

32-33. τὸ δ' ἐν ποςί μοι τράχον | ἴτω

'What lies at my feet must go forth running.' τὸ ἐν ποςί refers to the poet's 'immediate concern,' i.e., his encomiastic task in its narrowest sense which is to praise Aristomenes, as opposed to elaborating upon the glorious achievements of the Aeginetans. τράχον is predicative, with ἴτω, and stands on a par with ποτανόν (34).[55] Whereas ποτανόν ensures that the victor's fame is spread far and wide (see below), τράχον invests the spreading wide and far of the victor's fame and glory through the medium of song with the idea of speed. Cf. ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν | μαλεραῖc ἐπιφλέγων ἀοιδαῖc, | καὶ ἀγάνοροc ἵππου | θᾶccον καὶ ναὸc ὑποπτέρου παντᾶι | ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν, εἰ cύν τινι μοιριδίωι παλάμαι | ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον, *O.*9.21-6.[56]

For **τὸ ἐν ποςί** cf. ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δεῖμα μὲν παροιχομένων | καρτερὰν ἔπαυcε μέριμναν· τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸc | ἄρειον ἀεὶ βλέπειν | χρῆμα πάν, *I.*8.11-4; καὶ γὰρ | ἑτέροιc ἑτέρων ἔρωτεc ἔκνιξαν φρέναc· | τῶν δ' ἕκαcτοc ὀρούει, | τυχών κεν ἁρπαλέαν cχέθοι φροντίδα τὰν πὰρ ποδόc· | τὰ δ' εἰc ἐνιαυτὸν ἀτέκμαρτον προνοῆcαι, *P.*10.59-63; χρὴ τὰ ἐοικότα πὰρ δαιμόνων μαcτεέμεν θναταῖc φραcίν | γνόντα τὸ πὰρ ποδόc, οἵαc εἰμὲν αἴcαc. | μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον | cπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, *P.*3.59-62. The expression is, like *h.l.*, used in a transitional passage, from a 'digression' back to the strict encomiastic program, in *N.*6: ('I have plenty opportunity to praise Aegina; the Aeacids have done many a glorious deed. The singers of old have praised them; so do I with my own concern', 45-54) τὸ δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ ναὸc ἑλιccόμενον αἰεὶ κυμάτων | λέγεται παντὶ μάλιcτα δονεῖν | θυμόν. ἑκόντι δ' ἐγὼ νώτωι μεθέπων δίδυμον ἄχθοc | ἄγγελοc ἔβαν, κτλ., 55-57b. Here, too, on the level of the *tenor* of the image, τὸ πὰρ ποδί refers to the poet's 'immediate concern' which is to praise the victor, as opposed to expanding upon the glorious achievements of the Aeacids.[57] See further Young, *Three Odes*, ch. II *passim.*

In later authors the phrase often has negative connotations, referring to 'instant, pressing trouble.' Cf., e.g., βράχιcτα γὰρ κράτιcτα τὰν ποcὶν

---

[55] Thus Σ. *ad h.l.* (44a, II 210 Dr.); Dissen *ad loc.* ; Farnell I, p. 127.

[56] This idea of speed is also one of the connotations of the image of the chariot for song (τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον ἔccυταί τε Μοιcαῖον ἅρμα Νικοκλέοc | μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆcαι, *I.*8.61/2; *P.*10.65, *O.*9.80/1).

[57] The reference of τὸ πὰρ ποδί on the level of the *vehicle* has been a matter of dispute, due to the fact that ποδὲc ναόc is a nautical term for 'the two lower corners of a sail' or for the ropes attached to them, 'sheets' (cf., e.g., *Od.*5.260, S.*Ant.*715,

κακά, S.*Ant.*1327; τὰ δ' ἐν ποcὶ ... κακά, E.*Andr.*397; τοὺν ποcὶν γὰρ οἰcτέον κακόν, E.*Alc.*739; τὸ πρὸc ποcὶ cκοπεῖν, S.*OT* 130, referring to the problem of the Sphinx, as opposed to τἀφανῆ, viz. the question as to who murdered Laius.

Some critics take τὸ ἐν ποcί μοι τράχον together, as 'what is running before my feet.'[58] τράχον, then, would conjure up the idea of haste, conveying the suggestion that time is running out, so that a shift to the encomistic program were urgent.[59] *N.*4.33-5 would parallel the idea. However, nothing in the context points at time running out for the poet (ἄcχολοc does not automatically imply haste). The idea of the poet being in a hurry is less functional in the context than the suggestion that the victor's fame will spread quickly. Moreover, τὸ ἐν ποcί is a fixed expression, as, e.g., the position of the particle shows in E.*Alc.*739 (quoted above). This makes it *a priori* likely that the most natural interpretation is *not* to take the phrase together with τράχον.

For the phrase **ἴτω τράχον** cf. ἦλθε θέων, *Il.*6.54, 394, 11.715; ἷξε θέων, *Od.*3.288; ᾤχεο τρέχων, Epicharm.*fr.*37, 110 Kaibel; ᾤχετ' ἰών, *O.*6.38; ἐλαύνων ἵκετο, *O.*6.48.

33. τεὸν χρέοc

'My debt to you.' In the present context, this may seem virtually equivalent to 'my commission,' taken in its narrowest sense, viz. the poet's contractual obligation to praise Aristomenes of Aegina. But the connotations of the phrase are different. χρέοc does not present the poet's debt as caused by the ode having been commissioned (the fact of payment is completely suppressed), but rather as the natural, automatic obligation of the poet to praise what is praiseworthy. The compliment resides in the suggestion that the victor fully deserves the praise he is getting. This idea is commonly referred to as the 'χρέοc-motif.'

Leslie Kurke (*Traffic in Praise*, pp. 85-107) has demonstrated that the 'χρέοc-motif' is firmly rooted in the traditional aristocratic ideology of gift exchange. The victor has made considerable sacrifices in the form of expenditure (δαπάνα) and toil (μόχθοc, πόνοc, κάματοc). His victory gives him prestige, fame and glory (κλέοc, τιμά) in return. As Pindar emphasizes in many passages, his victory does not only

---

E.*Or.*706/7, *IT* 1135, Ar.*Eq.*436; not for 'rudder', *pace* the scholiast, who paraphrases τὸ πηδάλιον, and Bury *ad loc.*, quoting *Od.*10.32/3; but there, too, it refers to the 'sheets'; the speed of a ship depends more on their being handled well than the rudder). These lines make sense only if it is assumed that τὸ πὰρ ποδὶ ναόc is not borrowed from the technical nautical terminology. It is a mixed metaphor. The waves 'before the feet of the ship' are the waves directly before its bough.

[58] Thus Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 71); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 181; Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 212, 219.

[59] Thus Gildersleeve *ad h.l.* (p. 329: "τράχον shows that the matter is urgent, 'my immediate errand'"); Slater *s.v.* τρέχω (p. 512).

bestow prestige, fame and glory upon the victor himself, but also upon the whole community to which he belongs. Thus his victory involves a gift to the community, and this gift must be repayed. In sofar as his community share in his fame and glory, his victory creates a debt on their part. The proper way to repay this debt is to praise the victor. Therefore, in addition to conveying the complimentary suggestion that the victor fully deserves the praise the poet provides him with, the 'χρέος-motif' has a distinct persuasive function. In sofar as the poet speaks for himself, his praise sets an example; his explicit appeal to χρέος, to the obligation to praise, represents the principle according to which the audience have no choice but to follow his example. The choral performances of his odes represent this idea even more compellingly. The picture of the victor being praised by a chorus of fellow citizens is a strong visualization of the community as a whole repaying their debt to him. This idea is clearly expressed in the following passage: εἰ δ' ἀρετᾶι κατάκειται πᾶςαν ὀργάν, | ἀμφότερον δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις, | χρή νιν εὑρόντεςςιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον | μὴ φθονεραῖςι φέρειν | γνώμαις. ἐπεὶ κούφα δόςις ἀνδρὶ ςοφῶι | ἀντὶ μόχθων παντοδαπῶν ἔπος εἰπόντ' ἀγαθὸν ξυνὸν ὀρθῶςαι καλόν, *I*.1.41-6, where ξυνόν underscores the idea that the entire civic community benefits from the victors achievement,[60] a benefit that is reciprocal, witnessing 50/1: ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολιμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἁβρόν, | εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιςτον δέκεται, πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώςςας ἄωτον.

For instances of the 'χρέος motif' in which the noun χρέος occurs, cf. ἐπεὶ χαίταιςι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι ςτέφανοι | πράςςοντί με τοῦτο θεόδματον χρέος, | φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέςιν | Αἰνηςιδάμου παιδὶ ςυμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, *O*.3.6-9; γλυκὺ γὰρ αὐτῶι μέλος ὀφείλων ἐπιλέλαθ'· ... ἕκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος | ἐμὸν καταίςχυνε βαθὺ χρέος, *O*.10.3, 8/9; ςὺν ἀλαθείαι δὲ πᾶν λάμπει χρέος, B.8.21. Not only of the victory currently celebrated: ἐμὲ δ' οὖν τις ἀοιδᾶν | δίψαν ἀκειόμενον πράςςει χρέος, αὖτις ἐγεῖραι | καὶ παλαιῶν δόξα τεῶν προγόνων, *P*.9.103-5. Cf. also expressions like ἐμὲ δὲ ςτεφανῶςαι | κεῖνον ἱππίωι νόμωι | Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾶι | χρή, *O*.1.100-3; *O*.8.74, *I*.3.7/8, *N*.11.17; ἔςτιν ἀνθρώποις ἀνέμων ὅτε πλεῖςτα | χρῆςις· ἔςτιν δ' οὐρανίων ὑδάτων, | ὀμβρίων παίδων νεφέλας· | εἰ δὲ ςὺν πόνωι τις εὖ πράςςοι, μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι | ὑςτέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων | τέλλεται καὶ πιςτὸν ὅρκιον μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς, *O*.11.1-6. Different vocabulary that occurs in instances of the χρέος motif includes: μιςθός (*N*.7.63, *I*.1.47; cf. *P*.1.77), λύτρον (*I*.8.1, cf. *P*.5.106), ἀμοιβά (cf. *N*.5.48, with my note, p. 178), δίψα (*P*.9.104, quoted above; cf. *N*.3.6, with my note, pp. 251-3), and χάρις (*O*.10.12, *P*.10.64, *I*.3.8, etc.). Cf. also *O*.7.16, 13.96, *P*.1.59, 2.14, 5.106, 7.3, 10.66, *N*.1.7, 6.33, 57, 10.26, *I*.2.44, B.3.95, 8.21, 14.19.

---

[60] See Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 102/3 with n. 60.

• *Literature:* On the χρέοϲ-motif see, apart from Kurke, especially: Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, pp. 10/1, 54-9; Gianotti, *Poetica Pindarica*, pp. 19ff., 29-31; Ἰακώβ on *P.*4.1 (pp. 238/9); Lloyd-Jones, *JHS* 93, 1973, 129; Maehler, *Dichterberuf*, p. 85; Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, pp. 277-80; M. Weilbach, *Die Formen der Aufforderung in der griechischen Lyrik*, Diss. Lengerich 1938, pp. 65/6; Woodbury, *TAPhA* 99, 1968, 527-42. Further references are to be found therein.

33. ὦ παῖ

Conventions of the genre demand that Pindar and Bacchylides make clear explicitly if the victory they celebrate was won in any category other than the ἄνδρεϲ. If an ode is for a boy victor or an ἀγένειοϲ, we find an explicit reference to the victor as a παῖϲ or ἀγένειοϲ, an explicit reference to the victor's youth without the precise words παῖϲ or ἀγένειοϲ being used, or a reference to the victor's opponents as παῖδεϲ, ἀγένειοι, or as his ἅλικεϲ. The optional reference to the age category in the case of a man victory occurs frequently.

There are many straightforward examples of explicit references to the victor as an ἀνήρ, παῖϲ or ἀγένειοϲ. In *N.*6 (wrestling), the victor is called παῖϲ (13a); he is addressed as παῖ in line 62. In ἄραντο γὰρ νίκαϲ ἀπὸ παγκρατίου | τρεῖϲ ἀπ' Ἰϲθμοῦ, τὰϲ δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέαϲ, ἀγλαοὶ παῖδέϲ (Phylacidas, the victor, and Pytheas, his brother) τε καὶ μάτρωϲ (Euthymenes), *I.*6.60-2, παῖδεϲ implies that Phylacidas' Isthmian victory, currently celebrated, is a boy victory.[61] Quite often there is an explicit reference to the victor's being an ἀνήρ. In εὐθυμάχαν ὄφρα πελώριον ἄνδρα παρ' Ἀλφειῶι ϲτεφανωϲάμενον | αἰνέϲω πυγμᾶϲ ἄποινα, *O.*7.15/6, ἄνδρα is surely incompatible with a boy victor and therefore conveys the information that the victor competed in the category of men (cf. also lines 7/8 and 89), whatever the precise implications of the adjective πελώριον are.[62] Cf. further *O.*6.18, *O.*9.13, *P.*1.42, *P.*4.1, *P.*5.107, *P.*9.4, *N.*1.20, *N.*2.3, *I.*1.34, *I.*2.17, *I.*4.70, B.3.69. Cf. also τὰμ βαρύχειρα πάλαν, Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε, ϲὸν

---

[61] *Pace* J.B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*, London 1892, in his header and in his translation of the passage on p. 117; A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Cracow 1948, in his header. Pytheas' Nemean victory, commemorated by *N.*5, was not a boy victory, as it is here implied, but an adolescent victory (cf. *N.*5.6). Epinician conventions did not require the poet to provide explicit information about the age categories of earlier victories mentioned in victory catalogues. In τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰϲθμῶι διπλόα θάλλοιϲ' ἀρετά, | Φυλακίδ', ἄγκειται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν | Πυθέαι τε, παγκρατίου, *I.*5.17-9, nothing indicates that Phylacidas' earlier Isthmian victory was a boy victory (cf. *I.*6.62) and that Pytheas' Nemean victory was won in the category of ἀγένειοι (cf. *N.*5.6). On these lines, see also my 'The Date of Pindar's Fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' Thirteenth Ode', *CQ* 45, 1995, 321/2.

[62] The scholiast explains: ὅτι τεϲϲάρων πηχῶν καὶ πέντε δακτύλων ὁ Διαγόραϲ (Σ. 28a, I 205 Dr.). This would be 1.96 meter. "Übrigens sind das noch keine zwei Meter, also nichts Riesenhaftes," U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, p. 361

κατ' ἀγῶνα | ἀπτῶτ' ἀγγέλλω παῖδα κρατεῖν 'Ρόδιον | Πολυκρέοντος υἱὸν 'Αγηςίςτρατον, Ebert[63] no. 72.1-3; ἀλλ' ἀγένειος | διςςούς, τρεῖς δὲ ἑλόμαν ἀνδρ⟨ὸ⟩ς ⁝ [ἐ]ν ἁλικίαι, no. 77.7/8. Cf. also no. 12.2, 14.2, 37.4, 6, 40.2, 51.2, 70.2, 76A.7, 78.1, 79.19 (with Ebert *ad loc.*, pp. 243/4), etc. In B.8, the claim οὔτις ἀνθρώπων κ[αθ' Ἕλλα]νας cὺν ἅλικι χρόνω[ι] | παῖς ἐὼν ἀνήρ τε π[λεῦ]νας ἐδέξατο νίκας, 22-5, implies the victory celebrated must be in the category of men.[64]

Controversial are those odes in which the victor is addressed with παῖ and in which no other clue about his age is given: *N.*4.90 and *P.*8.33. These odes are not generally taken to be for boy victors. One should distinguish sharply between passages where παῖς is unqualified and those passages where παῖς goes with a genitive. In the latter case information is provided about the victor's lineage, not about his age.[65] It is illustrative to compare: 'Εμπεδίωνος παῖδες 'Αθηναῖοι δύ' ἐνίκων | Διοφάνης ἀγένειος ἐ[ν] 'Ισθμῶι πανκρατί[οιο] | κα[ὶ] πρόγονος στεφ[άνους], no. 40.1-3 in Ebert's collection. Unqualified παῖς, however, cannot possibly refer to a person whose age is not in fact the age of a παῖς. So addressing the victor with παῖ *tout court* certainly is adequate proof in itself that the ode celebrates a boy victory. *N.*4 and *P.*8 are for boy victors.[66] See further my 'Athletic Age Categories in Victory Odes', *Nikephoros* 11, 1998.

---

n. 1. Others point at the reminiscence of *Od.*9.187 (C.M. Bowra, *Pindar*, Oxford 1964, p. 215; W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar, Volume I: O.3, 7, 12, 14* [*Mnemosyne Supplement* 97], Leiden 1987, p. 54).

[63] J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen (Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.hist. Klasse* 63.2), Berlin 1972. References are to his epigram numbering, not to his page numbering.

[64] For the problems concerning the identification of the victor and the (related) question whether or not the remains of B.8 represent a separate ode, see Maehler's commentary, II pp. 137/8. Further references are to be found therein.

[65] That παῖς with a genitive does not imply youth appears, e.g., from ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς, *I.*6.16, of Lampon, the victor's father; Αἰνηςιδάμου παιδί, *O.*3.9, of Theron; ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, *P.*2.18, of Hieron. Cf. also παῖ Ποςειδᾶνος Πετραίου, *P.*4.138, of Pelias, who says ἤδη με γηραιὸν μέρος ἁλικίας | ἀμφιπολεῖ (157/8); Αἴςονος ... παῖς, *P.*4.118, of Jason, who says that he is twenty years old (104); 'Αοῦς τε παῖδ' Αἰθίοπα, *O.*2.83, of Memnon; Αἰήτα ... παῖς, *P.*4.11, of Medea; Κρόνου παῖδ', *O.*1.10, of Zeus, etc.

[66] For *N.*4 the same conclusion is reached by G. Fracarolli, *Le odi di Pindaro*, Verona 1894; J.B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, London 1890; L.R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, London 1930-2; Turyn; C.M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford 1935; M.M. Willcock, *Pindar. Victory Odes. Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*, Cambridge 1995; all print παιδί in their titles; *contra:* Wilamowitz, p. 401, and the Snell-Maehler edition (*Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Pars I Epinicia, Leipzig 1987). For *P.*8 the lack of trainer praise has troubled many scholars. See below. B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian & Pythian Odes*, New York 1890, speaks of the victor as "passing from the ranks of boy wrestlers", with reference to

33. νεώτατον καλῶν

'Of the demonstrations of your nobility, the newest,' i.e., 'the most recent of your deeds of excellence,' which in this context refers to 'your most recent victory'; syntactically in apposition to τεὸν χρέος. This phrase is echoed by καλόν τι νεόν in 88 below. καλός qualifies the appearance of something as fitting a noble: καλός is what an ἐςλός (or an ἀγαθός) looks like; καλὰ (ἔργα) are what he does. The noun καλόν is a generic term, referring to visible display of nobility, 'deeds of excellence' that go to prove that one is ἐςλός. It is no surprise that in Pindar, due to the subject matter of epinicia, the specific demonstration of nobility referred to by καλόν quite often is an athletic victory, as it is here.

The connotations of καλόν are quite clear in: ἀκίνδυνοι δ' ἀρεταὶ | οὔτε παρ' ἀνδράςιν οὔτ' ἐν ναυςὶ κοίλαις | τίμιαι· πολλοὶ δὲ μέμνανται, καλὸν εἴ τι ποναθῆι, *O.*6.9-11, where a καλόν consists in putting one's ἀρετά to the test in a situation of danger (war and games are examples); this is the due course of action for an ἐςλός, and this will gain him fame. Cf. *O.*1.81-4. Frequently the context specifies the reference of καλόν. A few examples may suffice in order to outline the range of the various excellent deeds which the notion may include: In ὁ δὲ καλόν τι πονή[ς]αις εὐαγορίαιςιν φλέγει, *Pae.*2.66, due to the generic character of the statement, καλόν refers to any 'deed of excellence'; the following lines give the victory of Abdera in the battle of Melamphyllon as an example of such a καλόν. Similarly, ἐςλῶν καλοῖς | ἔργοις, *O.*2.97/8, occurs in a gnomic context, which articulates the liability of καλὰ ἔργα to φθόνος; in the following lines the principle is applied to the χάρματα that Theron has bestowed upon his community; his victory is included in those, but the reference is less specific, including also his other deeds that have benefited the city. In μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέτιμανθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν cχερῶι κέλευθοι, *I.*6.22, the ἔργα καλά are the deeds of excellence of Aeginetans; the following lines give the famous exploits of the Aeacids as examples. In ὡραῖος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιςτά τε ῥέξαις, *O.*9.94, the following lines specify κάλλιςτα as Epharmostus' earlier victories. Cf. *O.*13.45, *P.*5.116/7, etc.

34. ἐμᾶι ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶι

'Winged by my skill.' The poet's μαχανά gives wings to the victor's latest achievement. Both the poet and the victor may be associated with 'flight' or 'wings.' The poet's art can be winged; the Muses may have wings; the person sung about may also be associated with wings or flight, as Aristomenes *h.l.* The idea underlying the image is that song, and, with it, also the person sung about, flies from mouth to mouth; thus the poet's art ensures that the fame and glory of the

---

line 78 (p. 324). C.M. Bowra, *Pindar*, Oxford 1964, p. 157 speaks of the victor as a boy, but in his *OCT* edition he does not print παιδί in the header of this ode.

laudandus is spread wide and far (cf. esp. Thgn.237-54; *O.*9.21-6, *N.*5.1-3 with my note, pp. 101/2).[67]

Homer's art is winged in: ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι | λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον· | ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσί οἱ ποτανᾶι ⟨τε⟩ μαχανᾶι | σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις, *N.*7.20-3. For the Muses giving wings to whom they celebrate cf. εἴη νιν εὐφώνων πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλααῖς | Πιερίδων, *I.*1.64/5; ὁρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν] | χρύσεον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρωι πτερόν, B.*fr.*20b.3/4; cf. Archil.181.11 W. (with Plu.*Garrulit.*10 [507a], *Amat.*3 [750b]). Song itself is winged in A.*Pr.*555. For the victor being airborne, cf. πολλὰ δὲ πρόσθεν πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν, *P.*9.125; ἐστεφάνωσε κυδίμων ἀέθλων πτεροῖσι χαίταν, *O.*14.24;[68] πέταται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσας τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν, *N.*6.48/9, of the Aeacids; σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷς ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον | πωτήσηι καὶ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀείρομενος | ῥηϊδίως, Thgn.237-9; cf. also *Il.*19.384-6; lines 88-91 below; Verg.*G.*3.9, etc. See further Most, *Measures of Praise*, pp. 150/1; Köhnken, *Funktion des Mythos*, p. 183; Bernardini, *Mito*, p. 20 n. 5; see also *CPh* 89, 1994, 307.

For **μαχανά** referring to the poet's 'means, resources', i.e., his 'skill,' cf. *N.*7.20-3 (cited above). The poet's skill is included in ἐκ θεῶν γὰρ μαχαναὶ πᾶσαι βροτέαις ἀρεταῖς, | καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ χερσὶ βιαταὶ περίγλωσσοί τ' ἔφυν, *P.*1.41/2. Whereas μαχανά refers to the poet's capacities, εὐμαχανία is the opportunity offered to the poet by the subject matter to exploit his μαχανά. εὐμαχανία refers to the 'opportunity' for the poet to praise, the the 'richness of the subject matter' (see *I.*4.1-3). Thus Archilochus is said to find himself in a position of ἀμαχανία, poetic resourcelessness, because he has chosen to blame instead of to praise: εἶδον γὰρ ἑκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίαι | ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν | πιαινόμενον, *P.*2.54-6.[69] Cf. *P.*9.92. On μαχανά see further my note on line 75 below.

ἀμφί is one of Pindar's favourite prepositions.[70] It occurs 64 times in the extant odes and fragments[71] When not used in a purely local or

---

[67] Nothing suggests that "in this passage his words are ... 'flying' about in circular motion, as if emphasizing his proximity to them and his control over them," as Mary Lefkowitz (*CJ* 72, 1977, 212) suggests.

[68] 'Wings' is a metaphor for the victory crown, which spreads fame in sofar as the victory it symbolizes spreads fame. The scholiast takes the phrase to refer to the psychological experience of extreme elation ('walking on air'): παρόσον ὁ στεφανούμενος γάνυται καὶ οἷον ὑπόπτερος καὶ μετάρσιος γίνεται, 35b (I 395 Dr.).

[69] On this passage see further Svenbro, *La parole et le marbre*, p. 178; Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans*, p. 224; Miller, *TAPhA* 111, 1981, 135-143; Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 100/101.

[70] See C. Bossler, *De praepositionum usu apud Pindarum*, Darmstadt 1862, p. 41; LSJ *s.v.*, B III; Schroeder, *Pythien*, p. 107, Pierson, *RhM* 11, 1857, 381; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 164 (§ 181).

[71] Compared to, e.g., 9 times in Bacchylides, 34 times in Herodotus, and 12 times in the whole of Plato; only the tragic poets come close to Pindar's frequency: 58 times in Aeschylus, 34 times in Sophocles, 144 times in Euripides. If one relates these numbers to the lengths of the corpora, one gets the following results: ἀμφί is more than 10 times as frequent in Pindar than in Herodotus, and even more than 85 times as frequent in Pindar than in Plato. Even with a considerable margin for

temporal sense, the preposition is implicit and 'colourless' to the extent that it does not impart any distinct, easily defined basic meaning. Pindar uses it, especially with the dative, as a means to interrelate two notions to one another while leaving implicit the precise nature of this connexion. His usage of the preposition ties in with his general tendency towards implicitness. See introduction pp. 23-34. Here ἀμφί conveys nothing more than that ποτανόν is in one way or another related to the poet's μαχανά. It is quite clear that one is meant to interpret that the poet's 'resources' cause the victor's latest achievement to be airborne; this interpretation of ἀμφί as 'by means of' depends more on the fact that μαχανά is a means to an end than that the preposition itself conveys this meaning.

For ἀμφί lending itself to the interpretation 'by means of' cf. κῆλα δὲ καὶ δαιμόνων θέλγει φρένας ἀμφί τε Λατοίδα cοφίαι βαθυκόλπων τε Μοιcᾶν, *P.*1.12, where the interpretation of the relation conveyed by the preposition depends on the semantics of cοφία; cf. further *P.*1.80, *O.*8.42, *N.*1.29, etc.

Epode B

35-37

For in wrestling following the footsteps of your mother's brothers, you do not refute Theognetus at Olympia, nor Clitomachus' brave-limbed victory at the Isthmus.

35. παιλαιcμάτεccι γὰρ ἰχνεύων ματραδελφεούc

παλαιcμάτεccι reveals the discipline in which Aristomenes has won (for the noun, always in the plural in Pindar, cf. *O.*9.13, *N.*7.72, *N.*10.22). At this point all the obligate information about the present victory has been given (name in 5, father's name in 19, place of origin in 23/4, venue in 5 and 19/20, age category in 33, and discipline here). Apparently Aristomenes continued a family tradition, which was by no means uncommon for Aeginetan combat sportsmen (the family in the Psalychiad clan to which Pytheas, Phylacidas, Euthymenes, and Themistius belong is a good example; their victories are commemorated in *N.*5, B.13, *I.*6, and *I.*5). The implication is that quality runs in the family. See my note on οὐ κατελέγχειc below.

For **ἰχνεύων**, referring to 'tracking down' the glory of one's relatives by following their route,[72] cf. τὸ δὲ cυγγενὲc ἐμβέβακεν ἴχνεcιν πατρὸc | Ὀλυμπιονίκα δὶc ἐν πολεμαδόκοιc | Ἄρεοc ὅπλοιc, *P.*10.12-4;

---

error, these numbers are quite significant. For the tragic poets the ratio is less significant: Aeschylus ca. 1: 1.1, Sophocles ca. 1: 1.3, Euripides ca. 1: 1.6.

[72] Cf. Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 38/9.

παῖς ἐναγώνιος, ὃς ταύταν μεθέπων Διόθεν αἶςαν | νῦν {τε} πέφανται | οὐκ ἄμμορος ἀμφὶ πάλαι κυναγέτας, | ἴχνεςιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος ἑὸν πόδα νέμων | πατροπάτορος ὁμαιμίοις. | κεῖνος γὰρ Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἐὼν κτλ., *N.*6.13-7.

As often, **γάρ** marks the beginning of an explicitly announced utterance. Cf. *O.*10.13, *O.*14.5, *P.*4.14, *P.*4.70, *P.*4.263, *P.*6.1, *I.*6.60. Lines 32-4 have announced that we are now going to deal with the occasion of this ode, Aristomenes' victory; γάρ marks that this is what we are now getting. However, not surprisingly for Pindar, the expectations raised on the part of the audience by the preceding announcement are not fulfilled exactly. Aristomenes is praised only *en passant;* the emphasis is upon the victories of his uncles. See introduction, pp. 41-5.

36. Ὀλυμπίαι τε Θεόγνητον

Pausanias saw Theognetus' statue in Olympia: Θεογνήτωι δὲ Αἰγινήτηι πάλης cτέφανον λαβεῖν ὑπῆρξεν ἐν παιcί· τὸν δὲ ἀνδριάντα οἱ Πτόλιχος ἐποίηcεν Αἰγινήτης, 6.9.1. Its inscription was by Simonides and read: Γνῶθι Θεόγνητον προcιδὼν τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν | παῖδα, παλαιcμοcύνης δεξιὸν ἀνίοχον, | κάλλιcτον μὲν ἰδεῖν, ἀθλεῖν δ' οὐ χείρονα μορφᾶς, | ὃς πατέρων ἀγαθῶν ἐcτεφάνωcε πόλιν. (30 Page, *Epigrammata Graeca*, =149 Bergk, 11 Diehl, *PLG* III.498).[73] Robert, *Hermes* 35, 1900, 141-195, has convincingly restored Theognetus' name in the Olympian victor list if P.Oxy. II 222.10 to the 76th Olympiad in 476 B.C.: (Ol.75, 480:) ...]κων Ἀργεῖος (Ol.76, 476:) [Θεόγνητος Αἰγι]νήτης (Ol.77, 472:) ...]κρατίδας Ταραντῖνος (Ol.78, 468:) ...]ημος Παρράς[ιος ("Zu dem Sieg des Neffen 446 paßt ein Knabensieg seines Oheimes 476. Die Vorhergehende Olympiade ist besetzt, und Ol.74 ist entschieden zu früh", Robert, p. 166). See also Moretti, *Olympionikai*, p. 90 n. 217.

Taken literally, Ὀλυμπίαι ... οὐ κατελέγχεις is slightly illogical, because 'in Olympia you do not refute Theognetus' implies that Aristomenes' victory, which confirmed Theognetus' reputation, has been won in Olympia, which is not the case. Of course, any misunderstanding is excluded as κατελέγχεις is a present and we have been told already that the event we are presently celebrating is a Pythian victory (5, 18-20; there would have been a real ambiguity if the verb were in a past tense).

• *Coordination:* The two parallel negative clauses are coordinated by means of **τε ... οὐ ... οὐδέ**. Only here in Pindar's extant works does

[73] Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 440, n. 1, and Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 527) are sceptical about the authorship.

this sequence occur (in 83-5 below the sequence οὔτε ... οὐδέ occurs). In the first place, the irregular sequence betrays a concern for avoiding symmetry, discernable also in the variation in the two objects of κατελέγχεις (see my note on line 37 below); the poet may have felt the need to avoid symmetry here more urgently than elsewhere because the two victories of the two uncles represent quite a symmetrical state of affairs for him to work in, while these are not so important as to allow him much space. Secondly, the sequence is not incompatible with the pragmatic structure of the sentence. τε anticipates the mentioning of another victory of another uncle, which is to be expected also because the plural ματραδελφεούς has preceded (as a contrast, οὐ ... οὐδέ lacks this element of anticipation, and is more at home in a context in which the second clause follows the first as a next, independent step, which could not as easily be anticipated). Moreover, τε anticipates a positive expression, which οὐ κατελέγχεις formally is not; but in sense it is, because it is a litotes.[74] The negation does not have focus function (as a contrast, with οὔτε ... οὔτε the negation would have had focus function in a higher degree, as if these statements were polemicizing against the idea that Aristomenes did refute his uncles).

36. οὐ κατελέγχεις

Great deeds of family members are manifestations of the excellence running in the family and result in a favourable expectancy as to the qualities of their relatives. A victor confirms the quality of his family by means of his victory. Through his victory he has proved to possess the same qualities as they did. By giving proof of his own quality he also gives additional proof of the quality of his ancestors, and therefore contributes to their fame, and subsequently honours them. This idea is here expressed negatively. Aristomenes is said not to have 'refuted' the reputation of his uncles (i.e., it was not the case that the outcome of his πεῖρα was negative). Cf. *N.*3.14-7 with my note *ad loc.* (p. 271). For the expression cf. esp. ἔστι δὲ καὶ διδύμων ἀέθλων Μελίσσῳ | μοῖρα πρὸς εὐφροσύναν τρέψαι γλυκεῖαν | ἦτορ, ἐν βάσσαισιν Ἰσθμοῦ δεξαμένῳ στεφάνους, ... ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετὰν | σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει, *I.*3.9-14; τόν (*sc.* Nicocles, the victor's cousin) μὲν οὐ κατελέγχει κριτοῦ γενεὰ | πατραδελφοῦ, *I.*8.65/6; ἦν δ' ἐσορᾶν καλός, ἔργῳ τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων, *O.*8.19; αἰσχύνει τε γένος κατὰ δ' ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἐλέγχων, Tyrt.10.9 W.; cf. also οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντά νιν, *P.*9.80.

[74] For some general remarks about litotes, see my note on *N.*3.76 (pp. 393/4).

37. οὐδὲ Κλειτομάχοιο νίκαν Ἰcθμοῖ θραcύγυιον

'Nor (did you refute) Clitomachus' brave-limbed victory at the Isthmus.' We do not have any information on Clitomachus in addition to what is said here. παλαιcμάτεccι in 35 implies that his victory was won in wrestling (like Theognetus', as the independent evidence confirms), which suits θραcύγυιον. Mentioning the Isthmian victory of the one uncle after the Olympian of the other is in keeping with the hierarchy of the festivals; Pindar does not necessarily present them chronologically. Symmetry is avoided: Ὀλυμπίαι Θεόγνητον stands on a par with Κλειτομάχοιο νίκαν Ἰcθμοῖ θραcύγυιον.[75] As often, the sequence is climactic.[76]

The adjective **θραcύγυιοc** occurs only here. It associates Clitomachus' wrestling victory with courage and limbs, i.e., with a dangerous and physical discipline. Cf. καὶ cθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θραcεῖ, *N.*5.39, with my note (pp. 165-7); (Olympia) ἵνα ταχυτὰc ποδῶν ἐρίζεται | ἀκμαί τ' ἰcχύοc θραcύπονοι, *O.*1.95/6; θραcυμάχανοc ... | Ἡρακλέηc, *O.*6.67/8. Cf. also δεξιόγυιοc, *O.*9.111; ἀγλαόγυιοc, *N.*7.4; νεόγυιοc, *N.*9.24.

38-42

Exalting the clan of the Meidylids you carry the word, the one that once Oicles' son stated in riddles when he saw at seven-gated Thebes the sons holding their ground in battle, when they had gone the second road from Argos, the Epigonoi.

38. αὔξων δὲ πάτραν Μειδυλιδᾶν

The scholiast (53a, II 211 Dr.) explains: φρατρία ἐν Αἰγίνηι Μειδυλιδῶν ἀπὸ προγόνου ἐπιδόξοc γεγονότοc· αὐτὸc δ' ἐν ἄλλοιc· ἁ Μ⟨ε⟩ιδύλου δ' αὐτῶι γενεά, φηcί (=*fr.*190).[77] A **πάτρα**, 'clan,' is a family that traces their lineage back to one ancestor whose name they bear (cf. *N.*4.77, *N.*6.35, *I.*6.63, *N.*7.70). For a victory being an honour to one's family see my note on οὐ κατελέγχειc above.

The mentioning of the name of the victor's clan is not part of the obligate information in epinicia, as can be derived from the fact that neither in *N.*5 nor in *I.*5, celebrating victories of Pytheas and Phylacidas respectively, the Psalychid clan is mentioned, while we know from *I.*6.63 that they belonged to it. That the clan is referred to here underscores Aristomenes' aristocratic backgrounds. If this ode was performed at a time when the old aristocracy had recently

---

[75] On avoidance of symmetry see my introduction, pp. 51/2.

[76] On climactic pairs see Race, *Style and Rhetoric*, pp. 165-80.

[77] Snell-Maehler suggest "fort. trahendum ad Isthm. 9, ~ v. 1 vel 7." If they are right, it is tempting to speculate about the possibility of *I.*9 celebrating Clitomachus' Isthmian wrestling victory.

regained favourable perspectives, such an aristocratic catch-word is not unfunctional. See interpretation, pp. 430-56.[78]

Other Aeginetan clans mentioned by name by Pindar are the Bassids (*N.*6.31), Blepsiads (*O.*8.75), Chariads (*N.*8.46), Euxenids (*N.*7.70), and Theandrids (*N.*4.73).

For **αὔξω**/αὐξάνω used metaphorically for 'exalting, elevating,' cf. e.g. τὰν cὰν πόλιν αὔξων, *O.*5.4; τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται | ὧν θεὸc ἁβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων, *N.*7.31/2; *P.*4.279, *P.*10.71, *I.*7.29; cf. also *N.*3.58 with my note (pp. 358/9).

38. λόγον φέρειc

'You carry the word' that was stated in riddles by Amphiaraus at Thebes. In enhancing the glory of his clan, the Meidylids, by means of his victory, Aristomenes qualifies for Amphiaraus' words being applied to him. What is the reference of λόγον?

Amphiaraus' words, which λόγον refers to, are given in 44-55. The context makes explicit that the poet's intention in introducing Amphiaraus' speech with its narrative setting is to draw a complimentary analogy between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence. Amphiaraus' words about the λῆμα of the fathers being visible in the sons, prompted by his seeing the Epigonoi displaying the same martial excellence as the Seven and especially by his recognizing his own prowess and mantic ability in his son Alcmaeon,[79] are explitily presented as applying to the victor's continuation of the athletic successes of his family.[80] It has been noted that lines 48-55, Amphiaraus' prophecy about the outcoming of the battle, are irrelevant to the explicitly avowed aim of the mythical example. This part of Amphiaraus' speech does not bear on the analogy between the victor and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence.[81] Some have ascribed the discrepancy to Pindar's failure to keep control over his material.[82] The fact that

---

[78] It is illustrative to contrast the proud reference to the clan here to the silence about the clan in *N.*5. *P.*8 polemicizes between the παχέεc and the δῆμοc, whereas *N.*5 advocates internal solidarity against an external enemy (cf. esp. 46/7). An explicit reference to an aristocratic institution could easily have been counter-productive in the latter case.

[79] It is Alcmaeon's martial quality that receives the chief emphasis in the immediate context. His mantic abilities are hinted at by the mention of his snake emblem on his shield (46, see my note *ad loc.*); they will be explicitly referred to in line 60 below. See also Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 32 n. 22. For Amphiaraus' double excellence cf. also *O.*6.17.

[80] Thus also Thummer, *Isthmische*, p. 45; Hess, *RhM* 88, 1939, 287/8; Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 198; and especially Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 31/2.

[81] See, e.g., Boeckh *ad loc.* (p. 311); Drachmann, *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*, p. 325; Christ *ad loc.* (p. 198); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 182.

[82] "So far as this prophecy of Amphiaraos concerns Alkmaion and his inherited

the latter part of Amphiaraus' speech (48-55) is irrelevant to the avowed aim of illustrating the power of inheritance, has led scholars to narrow down the reference of λόγον to either the *gnome* in 44/5[83] or to the first part of the speech (44-7). As Andrew Miller has demonstrated in an excellent discussion of this pasage (*CJ* 89, 1993, 31-4), the irrelevance of lines 48-55 to the avowed aim of 44-55 is yet another example of Pindar's familiar fictive mimesis of spontaneous text production. See my introduction, pp. 34-7. Miller describes the pattern of ordinary speech that Pindar imitates in this passage as follows: "what happens on the level of the fictional speaker" is that "he indeed *is* 'tempted to carry on the narrative too far' (Farnell, p. 195), loosing sight, in his enthusiasm for the episode, of the purpose for which he originally introduced it" (p. 33).

So the answer to the question as to exactly what λόγον refers to is quite complex. In principle, 'the words Amphiarus spoke at Thebes' refers to the words Amphiaraus spoke at Thebes, so to his speech as a whole (44-55). On the level of the extemporizing fiction, λόγον refers to Amphiaraus' whole speech as envisaged by the poet at this point, which is equivalent to the first part of the speech (44-7), the part of the speech that illustrates the power of inherited excellence; the latter part of the speech (48-55) being an irrelevant digression caused by the poet's enthusiasm for the episode. However, on the level of Pindar's real compositional concerns, the latter part of the speech is not irrelevant. On this level, too, λόγον refers to Amphiaraus' whole speech as envisaged by the poet at this point; but on this level this *is* in fact equivalent to Amphiaraus' whole speech.

φέρω qualifies as a 'colourless verb.' Its denotation is relatively unspecific: also in common every-day Greek, the verb may be used to refer to a relatively large variety of actions in reality. Pindar exploits the unspecificness of the verb, extending its usage slightly, in order to establish connections between notions, while not exerting himself to spell out the precise nature of the connection. See introduction, pp. 31/2. Here the Greek is no more specific than that it conveys that there is a connection between Aristomenes and the words spo-

---

courage, it is relevant to his [Pindar's] purpose; but he becomes irrelevant towards the close of it in regard to Adrastos and the death of his son. He may have found this in his epic original and was tempted to carry on the narrative too far (cf. the same fault in his story of Ixion, *P.*2.44-8)", Farnell *ad loc.* (p. 195); "Weil Amphiaraos ein Seher ist, muß er auch etwas prophezeien, also den Ausgang des Kampfes, Sieg des Adrastos und Tod seines Sohnes. Das hat inhaltlich auf die Gegenwart keinerlei Beziehung", Wilamowiz, *Pindaros*, p. 441.

[83] Thus the scholiast: τί δὲ εἶπε; φυᾷ τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει (55, II 211 Dr.).

ken by Amphiaraus. The context makes clear that this connection consists in the fact that, in honouring his clan, Aristomenes qualifies for Amphiaraus' words being applied to him; φέρειc, however, does not thus define this connection; it appeals to the audience's capacity of grasping it.[84]

The phrase μῦθον φέρω refers to the duties of a messenger in *Il.*10.288, 15.202; λόγουc ἐνέγκεcθαι occurs in this sense in E.*Supp.*583. Pindar uses λόγον φέρω in this sense in τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον ἔccυταί τε Μοιcαῖον ἅρμα Νικοκλέοc | μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆcαι, *I.*8.61/2, where the combination of the verb with a chariot conjures up the picture of the λόγοc being the Muses' cargo. It seems impossible thus to interpret the phrase here. For a comparable implicit usage of 'colourless' φέρω cf. θεῶν cέβεcθαι· ταύταc δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶc | ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρώμενον. | ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχοc βιατὰc νόημα τοῦτο φέρων, | ὃc ὑπερέφθιτο πατρόc, *P.*6.26-30. For the idea of the victor confirming the truth or validity of a mythical model, cf. also τὶν δ' αἶνοc ἑτοῖμοc, ὃν ἐν δίκαι | ἀπὸ γλώccαc Ἄδραcτοc μάντιν Οἰκλείδαν ποτ' ἐc Ἀμφιάρηον | φθέγξατ', *O.*6.12-4; cὺ ... ὀρθὰν ἄγειc ἐφημοcύναν, | τά ποτ' ... φαντὶ ... | Φιλύραc υἱὸν ... | Πηλεΐδαι παραινεῖν, *P.*6.19-23.

39-56. The Story of the Two Expeditions against Thebes

For Pindar's treatment of this story see interpretation, pp. 436-42.

Amphiaraus was a seer (*O.*6.13, 17), grandson of the seer Melampous (*Od.*15.225ff., Stesich.*fr.*17, D.S.4.68.4, Paus.2.18.4, Σ. Theoc.3.43, Σ. A.*Th.*551, Σ. E.*Phoen.*173), son of Oicles en Hypermnestra, Thestius' daughter (A.*Th.*609). He was protected by Apollo (*Od.*15.245, Stat.*Theb.*7.692ff.). He married Eriphyle (*v.i.*) who bore him Amphilochus and Alcmaeon (*Od.*15.248, cf. Athen.7.317a [= Bergk *PLG* [4] II 139]). Once Argos was ruled by three families (D.S.4.68.4, Apollod.1.9.12.8, Paus.2.18.4), but the Anaxagorids and the Melampodids contrived against the Biantids, viz. against Pronax and Adrastus, sons of Talaus and Lysimache, Polybus' daughter (Σ. *N.*9.30, Paus.2.66, Σ. Pl.*R.*590A). Amphiaraus defeated Pronax (Paus.3.18.12); Adrastus escaped to Polybus, whose power and property he inherited. When he returned to

---

[84] Contrast: καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμιcταὶ | λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, *I.*5.26/7, where a semantically precise verb is used to define the relation between the subject and the λόγοc. It is true that the verb φέρω sometimes lends itself to the interpretation 'earn, win' (*O.*8.64, *O.*9.98, *O.*10.67, *I.*7.21); one may be tempted to use these passages as an argument for an interpretation that our phrase here is analogous to *I.*5.27. But, apart from the fact that Aristomenes does not so much 'win' Amphiaraus speech (as the ἀγαθοὶ πολεμιcταί 'win praise') but rather confirms the validity of the model it sets, such an interpretation would involve a flaw of method. For it is the context that steers the audience to interpret φέρω as 'winning' in the passages cited; one cannot export such a contextually defined interpretation, which is no part of the denotation of the verb, to an occurrence of the same verb in a different context; that elsewhere we find λόγον in combination with a different verb, denoting 'winning,' is quite irrelevant to the semantics of φέρω.

Argos, his former enemies found themselves forced to reconsiliation. Adrastus gave his sister, Eriphyle, away in marriage to Amphiaraus (*N.*9.17), on the condition that she would be accepted as a referee in case any disagreement would arise again between the two former enemies (Σ. *N.*9.35, D.S.4.65.5, Σ. *Od.*11.326, Apollod.3.6.2). When Adrastus was organising an expedition against Thebes and Eteocles, Amphiaraus refused to take part, as he foresaw that it would end in disaster. Eriphyle was asked to decide the matter, but her brother, Adrastus, had bribed her: Amphiaraus saw himself forced to join the expedition. Amphiaraus prophecy came true. The expedition was a catastrophe. Amphiaraus himself defeated Melanippus (Hdt.5.67, Paus.9.18.1, Σ. *N.*10.12, Σ. *N.*11.43, B.*fr.*54, S.*fr.*731, Lyc.1066; cf. Apollod.3.6.8.3, Stat.*Theb.*8.715-65), but could not escape his death (*N.*9.24-7, *N.*10.8/9, Paus.1.34.2; cf. *O.*6.14, A.*Th.*588, S.*El.*837, S.*fr.*873, E.*Supp.*925, Apollod.3.6.8.4, Paus.2.32.2, 9.9.2, Prop.3.34.39, Ov.*Pont.*3.1.51, Stat.*Theb.* 7.690-823). All others died too, except for Adrastus who managed to escape because of the speed of his stallion Arion (*Il.*23.346, Σ. *I.*7.10, A.*Th.*50, Paus.8.25.8, Strab.9.404, etc.). Ten years later Adrastus organises a second expedition, with the six sons of the six fallen heroes of the first expedition. This is the expedition of the *Epigonoi.* Both Adrastus' son, Aegialeus, and Amphiaraus' son, Alcmaeon, take part. It is Alcmaeon who kills the Theban king, Laomedus, Eteocles' son, and who is the first to enter the city (line 47, cf. Apollod.3.7.2/3, D.S.4.66). The *Epigonoi* are more successful than their fathers. The Thebans are defeated, and none of the *Epigonoi* falls in battle, except for Adrastus' son Aegialeus (line 53, cf. Apollod.1.9.13.2, 3.7.2/3, Eustath.489.38, Paus.9.5.13, E.*Suppl.*1216, cf. Paus.1.44.4, 9.19.2). Some sources say that Adrastus dies of grief on his way home (Σ. *N.*9.30, Paus.1.43.1, cf. Suda *s.v.* 'Αδράcτεια Νέμεcιc), but Pindar says he reached Argos (lines 54/5). Alcmaeon killed his mother Eriphyle, in order to revenge her trickery against his father (Apollod.3.7.2.2, 3.7.5.1, D.S.4.66). Persecuted by the Erinyes, he reached his grandfather Oicles in Arcadia and later Psophis (S.*El.*840ff., Athen.6.223d, Verg.*A.*6.445, Prop.4.5.41, Ov.*Met.*9.406ff., etc.). See further esp. F. Bener, *Die Amphiaraos-Sage in der griechischen Dichtung*, Zürich 1945.

39. τὸν ὅνπερ ποτ'

ὅcπερ typically occurs in contexts where the relative clause identifies or defines.[85] Cf., e.g., οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιλα ἔργα γυναικῶν | Cιδονίων, τὰc αὐτὸc 'Αλέξανδροc θεοειδὴc | ἤγαγε Cιδονίηθεν ἐπιπλὼc εὐρέα πόντον, | τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν 'Ελένην περ ἀνήγαγεν εὐπατέρειαν, *Il.*6.289-92. For Pindar: *O.*1.30, 2.38, 4.19, *P.*3.100, 10.64, *N.*7.101, 8.18. For

[85] "In using περ a speaker conveys that the subordinate clause in which περ occurs has either an identifying or an equating function," Bakker, *Lampas* 19, 1986, 142.

περ, see also my note on *N.*3.80 ὀψὲ περ, pp. 412/3. Here τὸν ὅνπερ underscores the precise analogy between the idea of inherited excellence as displayed by the victor and as evident from Amphiaraus' speech with its narrative setting.[86] **ποτ'** (as often) signals a shift to the (mythical) past (see my note on *N.*5.9, p. 113).

39. Ὀϊκλέοс παῖс
Amphiaraus. He is mentioned by name in 56, after his speech.

39-40. ἐν ἑπταπύλοιс ἰδὼν | υἱοὺс Θήβαιс
The order in which the information, needed to grasp the narrative setting, is released in 39-43 is constitutive of a certain suspense in that it involves posing a riddle and then solving it. After the reference to Amphiaraus, this phrase, referring to unspecified 'sons at Thebes' strongly evokes the story of the Epigonoi. However, Amphiaraus' presence in this connection is puzzling, since he had died by then. In other words, although Ὀϊκλέοс παῖс ἐν ἑπταπύλοιс ἰδὼν | υἱοὺс Θήβαιс, in principle contains all the information needed for those familiar with the story to grasp the narrative setting, the veiled reference, in combination with the displacement of Amphiaraus in the wrong episode, will have them wondering. The explicit references in the following lines (41-3) prove them right in their initial associations and leave them no choice but to accept the presence of the deceased Ampheriaus within the view (ἰδών) of the battlefield.

•*Aspect:* It is worth noting that, contrary to what is sometimes believed, an aorist participle does not necessarily convey that the action it refers to is anterior to the action referred to by the finite verb. Here it is not. Amphiaraus was speaking *while* he was seeing the Epigonoi fighting, as the following lines make clear (43, 45-7). Here the choice of the aorist tense stem form is to be explained in terms of its information status. The fact that Amphiaraus *saw* the Epigonoi is by no means an assertion that can easily be inferred from the information that we have at this point, if only because to the best of our knowledge Amphiaraus had by then already been dead for some time. Moreover, the visual aspect is not unimportant. It is stressed again in the following lines (esp. θαέομαι сαφέс, 45; cf. also ἐπιπρέπει, 44). So ἰδών has *focus function* in a high degree, in which case the aorist is the most natural choice.

---

[86] Thus Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 32.

40. αἰνίξατο

The verb, 'speaking in riddles,' occurs only here in Pindar. But cf., e.g., ὁρῶ δέ μοι νιν, κἄςτι, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, | οὐδεὶς ποτ' ἄλλος ἢ ςύ· μῶν ᾐνιξάμην; S.*Aj.*1157/8; λόγοιςιν ... κρυπτοῖςιν ... αἰνίςςεται, E.*Ion.*430. The cognate noun αἴνιγμα occurs once in Pindar: αἴνιγμα παρθένου ἐξ ἀγριᾶν γνάθων, *fr.*177a, of the Sphinx. Since prophecies are often put in veiled language, the verb can get the connotation 'prophesy'; cf. ἐν τῆι προτέρηι νυκτὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων ἐδόκεε ὁ Ἵππαρχος ἄνδρα οἱ ἐπιςτάντα μέγαν καὶ εὐειδέα αἰνίςςεςθαι τάδε τὰ ἔπεα, Hdt.5.56, followed by a pair of prophesying hexametres.

Some scholars have been concerned about the fact that there is nothing dark or puzzling in Amphiaraus' speech.[87] Gildersleeve (*ad loc.*, p. 330) observes that speaking in riddles is in Amphiaraus' character, as he was an oracular hero. He does in fact prophesy in his present speech (48-55). If we take the verb to have a connotation of 'prophesying' here, which derives its relevance from 48-55, the choice of the verb implies that Pindar falls out of his role of the fictional ex tempore speaker, since, as observed above, on the level of this fiction, λόγον ... τὸν ὅνπερ ... αἰνίξατο refers to Amphiaraus' whole speech as envisaged by the speaker at this point, which is equivalent to the first part of the speech (44-7), the part of the speech that illustrates the power of inherited excellence; the latter part of the speech which is the prophecy (48-55) being an irrelevant digression caused by the poet's enthusiasm for the episode.

40. παρμένοντας αἰχμᾶι

'Holding their ground in battle.' For **παραμένω**, 'stand fast' (esp. when facing danger, as opposed to fleeing from it), cf. ἦ κεν ἀμνάςειεν, οἵαις ἐν πολέμοιςι μάχαις | τλάμονι ψυχᾶι παρέμειν', *P.*1.47/8; *Il.*13.151, Hdt.1.82, 6.14, etc. Cf. also εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾶι παρμένων, *P.*1.89. Cf. also προςμένοι in *N.*3.60 with my note (p. 361).

αἰχμά literally means 'point' (of a spear: δουρὸς | αἰχμὴ χαλκείη, *Il.*6.319/20; 16.315, or of arrows: A.*Pers.*239), frequently referring (along the lines of the common semantic broadening known as *pars pro toto*) to a 'spear' (*O.*9.79, *P.*4.79, *N.*3.33, *I.*1.24). However, the statement that the Epigonoi 'stood fast with their spears,' although not nonsentical, is not very functional: αἰχμᾶι would then constitute

---

[87] Thus the scholiast: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπεφθέγξατο· οὐ γὰρ αἰνιγματωδῶς εἶπε, comparing 'Οθρυονεῦ, πέρι δή ςε βροτῶν αἰνίζομ' ἁπάντων, *Il.*13.374 (57a, II 211/2 Dr.). Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 72) suggests an explanation on the basis of Pindar's *Vorlage*: "aber warum soll die im Epos erzählte Geisterrede, auf die Pindar anspielt, nicht noch dunklere Andeutungen enthalten haben, als die zitierten Worte uns ahnen lassen?"

a rather flat limitation of παρμένοντας. Pindar sometimes uses αἰχμά as a symbol of martial activity or prowess in general. Cf. ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ νέων οὐλίαις αἰχμαῖσιν ἀνδρῶν, *O.*13.23; γείτονες, ὧν κλέος ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς, *P.*1.66; ἔνθα βουλαὶ μὲν γερόντων | καὶ νέων ἀνδρῶν ἀριστεύουσι αἰχμαί, *fr.*199.1/2; γέρας ἔχει ... Κάστορος δ' αἰχμὰ Πολυδεύκεός τ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ῥεέθροις, *I.*5.33; Ἀσίας εὐρυχόρου τρίπολιν νᾶσον πέλας | ἐμβόλωι ναίοντας Ἀργείαι σὺν αἰχμᾶι, *O.*7.18/9. These passages have in common that the rendering 'spear' is entirely possible, although the context makes clear that the reference is more generic. There is one passage in Pindar where αἰχμά is a real metaphor, for 'fighting spirit': θρέψε δ' αἰχμὰν Ἀμφιτρύωνος, *N.*10.13, *sc.* Zeus.[88] Moreover, there are a few passages, though none in Pindar, in which αἰχμά is a metaphor for 'battle'; LSJ cite: ἐπειδή σφι πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους κακῶς ἡ αἰχμὴ ἐστήκεε, Hdt.7.152; θηρῶν ἐν αἰχμῆι, E.*HF* 158. Both the attested metaphorical usages would give good sense here. With the former, 'stood fast with their fighting spirit,' the dative is comparable to τλάμονι ψυχᾶι in *P.*1.47/8 (see above); with the latter, 'stood fast in battle,' the dative is comparable to οἵαις ... μάχαις in *P.*1.47/8. It is not easy to make a choice here. On the one hand, a reference to the 'fighting spirit' of the Epigonoi is complimentary; on the other, a reference to their 'battle' is not unfunctional from an informational point of view, as it helps to define the narrative setting. The only thing we can be certain about is that παρμένοντας αἰχμᾶι as a whole conveys that the Epiginoi were fighting a battle and that they did so bravely and with success. Since connotations of courage and victory are already present in παρμένοντας, I incline to taking αἰχμᾶι to mean 'in battle.'

In the light of the information that has preceded, evoking on the one hand the story of the Epigonoi through the reference to the sons, on the other, through the reference to Amphiaraus, the story of the Seven, this phrase performs a necessary informative function in that it refers to successful warfare, which excludes the latter connotation. The following lines disambiguate the matter completely. Moreover, παρμένοντας visualizes the prowess of the Epigonoi. This will be elaborated in 45-7 for Alcmaeon.

---

[88] If in *I.*4.51 the mss. reading αἰχμᾶι is kept, instead of following de Pauw in reading ἀκμᾶι, this passage would fit in this category. However, αἰχμᾶι for ἀκμᾶι is not uncommon as a scribal error, witnessing *N.*6.52 and *N.*10.60, where the metre unmasks the curruption.

Strophe Γ

41-42. ὁπότ' ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἤλυθον | δευτέραν ὁδὸν Ἐπίγονοι

'When they had come from Argos the second road, the Epigonoi.' The over-all pattern of releasing information about the narrative setting in 39-42 is from veiled to specific (see above). Lines 41-2 show this tendency quite clearly: ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἤλυθον could apply to both expeditions. δευτέραν ὁδόν is a poetic way of making clear that it is the second expedition that forms the narrative setting. The unequivocal reference to the Epigonoi comes last.

For verbs of movement with an accusative object referring to the route (instead of the destination), cf. e.g. ὁδὸν ἁγεμονεῦσαι | ταύταν, *O.*6.25/6; ὀρθὰν κέλευθον ἰών, *P.*11.39; ἔβαινε Δωρίαν κέλευθον ὕμνων, *fr.*191; ὁδὸν | εὐθυπορεῖ, *O.*7.90/1; ὁδὸν ἐλθέμεναι, *Il.*1.151; οἴκαδε ἱέμενοι ἄλλην ὁδόν, ἄλλα κέλευθα | ἤλθομεν, *Od.*9.261/2; *Il.*1.151, *Od.*3.316, A.*Pr.*962, A.*Th.*714, E.*Alc.*1153, etc.

For **ὁπότε** with the aorist indicative, cf. *O.*1.37, *P.*3.91, *P.*12.11, *I.*7.6, *fr.*33d.3. With the imperfect: *O.*9.97, *P.*11.19, *I.*1.25. ὁπότε, like ἁνίκα, gives an explicitly temporal reference, usually (with durative actions) denoting temporal simultaneity. With terminative actions, like here,[89] the aorist conveys that the natural end-point has been reached; ὁπότε provides a temporal reference to the situation prevailing after the end-point has been reached: to the situation that had arisen as the Epigonoi had completed their journey from Argos to Thebes.

43-47

Thus he spoke as they were fighting: "By nature the noble determination is conspicuous from the fathers in the sons. I see him clearly, weilding the coiled snake on his blazing shield, Alcmaeon, the first in the gates of Cadmus. ..."

43. ὧδ' εἶπε μαρναμένων

For a genitive absolute with implied subject cf. line 85 below, and further: ὔμμιν δέ, παῖδες Ἀλάτα, πολλὰ μὲν νικαφόρον ἀγλαΐαν ὤπασαν | ἄκραις ἀρεταῖς ὑπερελθόντων ἱεροῖς ἐν ἀέθλοις (*sc.* Ὧραι), *O.*13.14/5; ὣς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος ἀπὸ κρόκεον ῥίψαις Ἰάσων εἷμα θεῶι πίσυνος | εἴχετ' ἔργου, *P.*4.232/3; ὣς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος οὐ γνώμαι διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν (*sc.* Ζεύς), *N.*10.89; τλάντ[ω]ν δ' ἔπειτα θεοὶ συνετέλεσσα[ν], *Pae.*2.64/5.[90]

---

[89] *Aktionsart* is about actions, not about verbs. In certain contexts ἔρχομαι could perhaps be part of the description of a durative action; here, however, because of the addition of a direct object referring to the road from Argos to Thebes, the *Aktionsart* is clearly terminative.

[90] The construction already occurs in Homer (*pace* Gildersleeve on *O.*13.15): ἤτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ | παλλομένων, Ἀίδης δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα, | Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσιν, *Il.*15.190-2.

The question as to the function of such a genitive absolute with implied subject here, is approached best by considering the alternatives. A conjunct participle is impossible because of the difference of subject. A subordinate clause would perhaps have been possible; this would require a conjunction like ἐπεί or an explicitly temporal conjunction like ὁπότε or ἀνίκα, which would result in a higher degree of explicitness than necessary: the context makes perfectly clear that the two actions are (temporally) related. A dative participle would have been possible; in this case μαρναμένοις would mark the fighting men as the addressees of the speech; but Amphiaraus is not addressing the Epigonoi, as the third person references to some of them prove. Probably the most plausible alternative would have been ἐν μαρναμένοις: this comes quite close to what the phrase conveys as it is now. There is, however, a slight difference in the degree of explicitness, since ἐν would impart that Amphiaraus was standing in de midst of the havoc, whereas μαρναμένων leaves his precise location to the imagination of the audience. In sum, the genitive absolute with implied subject has the obvious advantage of being concise. It is exactly as informative as it needs be. The phrase is suggestive: the poet presents an arresting picture of Amphiarus' ghost speaking as the Epigonoi are fighting their battle, while not committing himself to a precise description of the situation.

• *Speech Caps:* There are twenty-six occurrences of direct speech in Pindar: *O.*1.75-85, 4.24-7, 6.16/7, 6.62/3, 8.42-6, 13.67-9, *P.*3.40-2, 4.13-56, 4.87-92, 4.97-100, 4.102-119, 4.138-55, 4.156-67, 4.229-31, 8.44-55, 9.30-37, 9.39-65, *N.*10.76-9, 10.80-8, *I.*6.42-9, 6.52-4, 8.35a-45, *Pae.*2.73-5, *Pae.*4.40-57 (breaking off before the speech ends), *fr.*43.1-5 and *fr.*168b.1-7 (consisting only of direct speech). These passages are preceded by an explicit capping of the type 'he/she spoke as follows,' excepting *I.*8.35a-45 and *Pae.*2.73-5. The end of the speech is as a rule marked by a similar capping, with three exceptions: *O.*6.16/7, *O.*6.62/3, and *P.*9.30-7; in *O.*4.27 the end of the speech coincides with the end of the ode. Pindar seems to have aimed at a maximum degree of variation between the opening and closing cappings: only in one passage the same verb is used for both (*I.*6.52-4, introduced by εἶπέν τε φωνήσαις ἅτε μάντις ἀνήρ, and closed off by ὣς ἦρα εἰπὼν αὐτίκα ἕζετ'); in none of the passages does the same deictic element (e.g. ὧδε, ὥς, τόδε, τοιαῦτα, οὕτως) occur in both cappings. For εἰπεῖν, 'to speak the word,' cf. my note on *N.*5.14 (pp. 118/9).

44-45. φυᾶι τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει | ἐκ πατέρων παισὶ λῆμα

'By nature the noble determination is conspicuous from the fathers in the sons.' For the phrase cf. τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς ἐμβέβακεν ἴχνεσιν πατρός, *P.*10.12. λῆμα (related to the Doric verb λῶ, 'want', Ar.*Lys.*

95, 981, 1162, *Ach.*766, Theoc.4.14, 5.21, etc.) means 'will, determination, resolve, resoluteness.' See my note on *N.*3.83 (pp. 419-20). Here τὸ γενναῖον λῆμα, the resolve that is germane to their γένος, refers to the 'determination' that the Epigonoi share with their fathers, viz. to sack Thebes.[91] Amphiaraus observes that this resolve, originating from the fathers, 'is conspicuous' in the sons, and he ascribes the fact that the λῆμα is inherited to φυά, to 'nature.' φυᾶι makes clear that the principle described, of λῆμα having been passed on from father to son, is a principle that is in keeping with the natural course of things. For the more pregnant usage of φυά in opposition to δίδακτα, see my note on *N.*3.40-2 (pp. 324-8). References are to be found there.

The basic meaning of **γενναῖος** is 'germane, genuine to one's γένος,' cf. οὔ μοι γενναῖον ἀλυσκάζοντι μάχεσθαι, *Il.*5.253, which the A-scholiast paraphrases as ἐγγενές, πάτριον. Because one is especially tempted to attributie qualities to one's lineage when one is of noble descent, γενναῖος frequently has the connotation 'of high birth,' cf. ὦ γονῆι γενναῖε, S.*OT* 1469; Hdt.1.173, Arist.*Pol.*1296b22, etc. As nobility was as a rule associated with commendable ethical qualities, γενναῖος may have the connotation 'noble of spirit,' cf. ὦ γενναιότατε ἀνδρῶν, σὺ κεῖνος εἷς ὃς ἐμοὶ οὐδεμίαν ἔχοντί κω δύναμιν ἔδωκας, εἰ καὶ σμικρά, Hdt.3.140, S.*Ph.*1402, etc. (see also Wilamowitz on E.*HF* 872, Fraenkel on A.*Ag.*1198). Here the λῆμα of the Epigonoi is 'genuine to their γένος,' as their farthers had it too; the connotations of nobilty conjure up the idea of such a behaviour, holding on to their fathers' firm determination to sack Thebes, being the proper thing to do for a noble. The adjective emphasizes the power of inherited excellence.

For **ἐπιπρέπει** (only here in Pindar) see my note on ἔμπρεπει, line 28 above (pp. 507/8). The echo may have been intended. In both contexts the verb is used of the inherited excellence of one generation being conspicuous in the other.

45-47. θαέομαι σαφές | δράκοντα ποικίλον αἰθᾶς Ἀλκμᾶν' ἐπ' ἀσπίδος | νωμῶντα

'I see him clearly, Alcmaeon, weilding the coiled snake on his blaz-

[91] In the light of the circumstance that the expedition of the fathers was a failure, the word λῆμα has in fact been very accurately chosen. Because of the lack of success, the noblest characteristic of the expedition of the Seven was exactly their firm determination. A word like ἀρετά, e.g., or δόξα, instead of λῆμα, would have been less appropriate, since these are related too much to actual success. For the λῆμα of the fathers cf. δοκῶ (*sc.* Eteocles) μὲν οὖν σφε (*sc.* Amphiaraus) μηδὲ προσβαλεῖν πύλαις — | οὐχ ὡς ἄθυμος οὐδὲ λήματος κάκηι, | ἀλλ' οἶδεν ὥς σφε χρὴ τελευτῆσαι μάχηι, A.*Th.*615-7.

ing shield.' Amphiaraus sees his son excelling in battle (cf. next note); he recognizes his own martial abilities in his son. Thus this observation illustrates the preceding statement about the power of inherited excellence.

Information about Alcmaeon's coat of arms may at first sight seem trivial. However, the mere fact that it is mentioned, and that almost a complete line is devoted to it, gives rise to the suspicion that the detail is meant to have more relevance than that it gives us a vivid picture of the battlefield. The scholia give three different interpretations of the relevance of the snake: (1) It is a mantic symbol;[92] cf. δύο δὲ γλαυκῶπες αὐτὸν (*sc.* Iamos) | δαιμόνων βουλαῖϲιν ἐθρέψαντο δράκοντεϲ ... περὶ θνατῶν δ' ἔϲεϲθαι μάντιν ἐπιχθονίοιϲ ἔξοχον, *O.*6.45-51. (2) It is a chthonic symbol hinting at Amphiaraus' death.[93] (3) It was the traditional coat of arms of the Melampodids.[94] The fact that Alcmaeon's mantic abilities are to become relevant in line 60 below makes the first interpretation highly attractive. It is accepted by most scholars,[95] some of them combining it with (2) in observing that the chthonic theme fits an oracular hero.[96] Thus the reference to the snake underscores that Alcmaeon has inherited not only his father's martial capacities, but also his mantic abilities.

Both Aeschylus in his *Septem* (in the messenger speeches in 375-652) and Euripides in his *Phoenissae* (1104-40) describe the shield-symbols of the seven heroes attacking Thebes. In both catalogues Amphiaraus wields a blank shield, symbolising the moral distiction between Amphiaraus and the other Argive leaders (ϲῆμα δ' οὐκ ἐπῆν κύκλωι, A.*Th.*591; ὁ μάντιϲ Ἀμφιάραοϲ, οὐ ϲημεῖ' ἔχων | ὑβριϲμέν' ἀλλὰ ϲωφρόνωϲ ἄϲημ' ὅπλα, E.*Phoen.*1111/2). The shields of the six remaining Argive leaders are discribed differently in both plays. For a complete overview see Mastronarde on E.*Phoen.*1107 (pp. 460/1). Snakes occur twice: in A.*Th.*486-500 Hippomedon's shield symbol is a fire-breathing Typhos with many

---

[92] ὅτι ἐπιτήδειον πρὸϲ οἰωνοὺϲ τὸ ζῶιον, μάντιϲ δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀμφιάραοϲ· ὁ δὲ παῖϲ ϲημεῖον τῆϲ τοῦ πατρὸϲ ἔϲωιζε τέχνηϲ, 66a, II 213 Dr.

[93] ἐπεὶ γηγεγὲϲ τὸ ζῶιον καὶ καταδύον εἰϲ τὰϲ ὀπὰϲ τῆϲ γῆϲ, κατέδυ δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀμφιάραοϲ, 66b, II 213 Dr.

[94] καθὸ ἦν ἀπὸ Μελάμποδοϲ. ἱϲτοροῦϲι δὲ δύο δράκονταϲ διαλεῖξαι τὰϲ ἀκοὰϲ τοῦ Μελάμποδοϲ καὶ διατρῆϲαι πρὸϲ ἀλλήλαϲ· διὸ καὶ δοκεῖ αἰϲθάνεϲθαι τῆϲ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώιων φωνῆϲ, 66c, II 213 Dr.

[95] Gildersleeve *ad loc.*, p. 330; Fennell *ad loc.*, p. 241; Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 303).

[96] Schroeder *ad loc.*, p. 72; Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 210; Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 574). On the symbol see further Rohde, *Psyche*, I 333, 142/3. In addition to this explanation, Kirkwood (*ad loc.*, p. 210) suggests that "the dragon was a recurrent symbol of Thebes" (cf. S.*Ant.*126/7, 1125), because the ϲπαρτοί sprung from the dragon's teeth sown by Cadmus. This connotation, in reminding us of Alcmaeon's Theban origin, would emphasize the idea of Alcmaeon having returned to his own city. This does not seem to have any specific significance in this ode. Giannini suggests that the snake is also a symbol of war, referring to Paus.10.26.3.

snakes growing from his waist (ὄφεις; the messenger emphasises that the image is very scary); in E.*Phoen.*1134-40 Adrastus has a shield with serpents (δράκοντες) snatching Thebans from within the walls. See further also W.G. Thalmann, *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus's Seven Against Thebes*, New Haven & London 1978, pp. 105 ff.

ποικίλος denotes 'variegated.' The snake is 'spotted,' cf. ποικίλον κάρα δρακόντων, *P.*10.46, of Medusa's head; γλαυκῶπα ... ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν, *P.*4.249; ποικίλον ... ὄφιν, Thgn.602. See further my note on *N.*5.28 (pp. 147/8). **αἰθός**, 'fiery, blazing,' occurs only here in Pindar, but cf. αἴθωνα κεραυνόν, *O.*10.83, *P.*3.58; αἴθωνι ἁλίωι, *N.*7.73; αἰθοίσας φλογός, *O.*7.48; αἰθόμενον πῦρ, *O.*1.1, *Pae.*6.97. αἶθοψ is a fixed Homeric epithet of weaponery, the metal shining in the blazing sun so as to evoke associations with fire (αἴθοπι χαλκῶι, *Il.*4.495, 5.562, etc.). For **νωμάω** of weilding weapons, cf. πολλὰ δ' ἔμβαλ' ἕλκεα νωμῶν[97] τραχὺ ῥόπαλον, *fr.*111.2.

47. πρῶτον ἐν Κάδμου πύλαις

Alcmaeon was the first to fight his way into Thebes. He excelled among his fellow Epigonoi. This phrase portrays Alcmaeon in his most glorious moment: he is about to enter the city, thus on the brink of success where the Seven failed, and he is the first.[98]

ANTISTROPHE Γ

48-55

"... *The other, who suffered in previous misfortune, is now entangled in the message of a better bird, Adrastus the hero. But at home he will fare the opposite. For he alone of the Danaans' army will gather the bones of a dead son when through the fortune from the gods he arrives with his folk unharmed at the broad streets of Abas.*"

Amphiaraus prophesies the outcoming of the expedition. Adrastus, who suffered a bad defeat as the leader of the Seven, will now succeed as the leader of the Epigonoi. Nonetheless, he will not be as fortunate in the private sphere: he will lose his son, Aegialeus, who will be the only casualty.

Scholars have observed that this second part of Amphiaraus' speech is irrelevant to the avowed aims of the myth which are to illustrate the power of inherited excellence. As observed above (on 38. λόγον, pp. 523/4), the irrelevance exists only on the level of the fiction of the

---

[97] ἕλκεα πλευρὰς ἔμβαλεν ὦμον codd.: πλευρὰς del. Heringa: ἔμβαλ' ἕλκεα Boeckh: νωμῶν Vulcanius, Π.

[98] Later sources agree that he was the first (Apollod.3.7.2/3; D.S.4.66, Paus.9.5.13).

ex tempore speaker. See further my interpretation, pp. 438-40.

Not only are we presented the outcoming of the expedition in Amphiaraus' words, the choice of words also reveals his point of view. The speech is in character. Amphiaraus had been tricked into the expedition of the Seven, against his will, and to his peril. When Adrastus organized his first expedition and asked Amphiaraus to join in, the seer foresaw the debacle and refused to cooperate. Adrastus did not accept this, strife arose, and both men agreed on Eriphyle, Adrastus' sister and Amphiaraus' wife, to settle the matter. Adrastus bribed her with Harmonia's famous necklace and Amphiaraus saw himself obliged to go.[99] Amphiaraus fell in battle with all the others; Adrastus was the only survivor. Against this background, one would not expect Amphiaraus to be very benevolent towards Adrastus or very content about his imminent success. As remains to be argued, the entire prophecy (48-55) can be read as said with an undertone of bitterness and frustration. καμών (48) is ironical as a description of the one survivor; ἐνέχεται (49) conjures up Adrastus' improper obsession that led to disaster in the case of the first expedition; ἀγγελίαι (50) emphasizies Adrastus' inability to interpret the omina; the unduly graphic description of the death of Adrastus' son can be read as betraying a certain satisfaction on the part of the speaker; τύχαι θεῶν (53) is syntactically ambiguous; it can be read as qualifying the preceding clause foretelling the death of Adrastus' son.

Pindar has exerted himself to portray his personage, in the words he lays in his mouth, in a psychologically convincing way. But he does so in a veiled manner. A careless listener could easily interpret Amphiaraus' prophecy as a neutral account of the future facts. A listener who is familiar with the story as a whole, taking into account Amphiaraus' past experiences with Adrastus, and imagining their consequences for Amphiaraus' attitude towards Adrastus on the moment that forms the setting of the story, is granted the intellectual pleasure of discovering in Amphiaraus' speech an undertow of bitterness which is precisely in keeping with how he would expect him to respond to the situation.

48. ὁ δέ

Referring to a story participant with a pronoun in the marked position directly before δέ is a very common means of effecting *topic shift*. ὁ δέ thus, as a rule, refers to 'the other.' What is unusual here (i.e., to the standards of good narrative prose) is that the identity of 'the

---

[99] Adrastus' bribing of Eriphyle, to Amphiaraus' peril, was a familiar story already in Homer's days, witnessing the allusions in *Od.*15.246/7 and 11.326/7.

other' cannot be inferred from the preceding context. Only at the very end of the sentence 'the other' is identified as Ἄδραϲτοϲ ἥρωϲ (51). This is a means of hightening the audience's attentiveness. A similar word order occurs in *P.*4.78/9, *P.*6.10-4, *P.*9.113/4.

48. καμὼν προτέραι πάθαι

'Who suffered in the previous disaster,' *sc.* Adrastus, under whose command the previous expedition against Thebes (the expedition of the Seven) was defeated. In Pindar, **πάθα** is a strong word, referring without exception to severe misfortune, so as to suitably refer to an expedition that resuted the death of all its leaders except one.

Cf. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Πυθῶνάδ', ἐν θυμῶι πιέϲαιϲ χόλον οὐ φάτον ὀξείαι μελέται, | ὤιχετ' ἰὼν μαντευϲόμενοϲ ταύταϲ περ' ἀτλάτου πάθαϲ, *O.*6.37-8; "οὐκέτι | τλάϲομαι ψυχᾶι γένοϲ ἁμὸν ὀλέϲϲαι | οἰκτροτάτωι θανάτωι ματρὸϲ βαρείαι ϲὺν πάθαι," *P.*3.40-2; τὸν μὲν ὀξείαιϲι θύγατρεϲ ἐρήμωϲαν πάθαιϲ | εὐφροϲύναϲ μέροϲ αἱ τρεῖϲ, *P.*3.97/8; ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι | λόγον Ὀδυϲϲέοϲ ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἁδυεπῆ γένεϲθ' Ὅμηρον, *N.*7.20/1, where πάθαν includes all of Odysseus' sufferings, as set out in *Od.*1-95 (cf Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 145).

κάμνω, 'suffering (physical) discomfort', in martial contexts, as a rule, refers to 'being killed in battle,' especially the aorist participle (cf. πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων, *P.*1.80; 78, A.*Supp.*231, E.*Supp.*756, Th.3.59, etc.; cf. also A.*Ag.*670). In Homer the aorist participle without exception refers to the dead (*Il.*3.278, 23.72, 444, *Od.*11.476, 24.14). Applied to Adrastus' fate during the expedition of the Seven, the associations of death evoked by καμών are ironical.[100] He was the only one to survive the disaster. From Amphiaraus' mouth the irony gets a bitter taste, which is in keeping with the reaction one may expect from a man who has all the right to hold Adrastus responsible for his death (see above).

For **προτέραι** see my note on *N.*3.13 (p. 270).

49-51. νῦν ἀρείονοϲ ἐνέχεται | ὄρνιχοϲ ἀγγελίαι | Ἄδραϲτοϲ ἥρωϲ

'He is now possessed by the message of a better bird, hero Adrastus.' Amphiaraus prophesies that the expedition of the Epgonoi will be successful. The emphatically placed νῦν underscores the contrast between the current and the previous expedition. That Adrastus is following a *message* of a better omen is significant. The catastrophe of the first expedition was due to the fact that Adrastus, unlike Amphiaraus, did not have an eye for the signs. In stating that Adrastus is acting upon a second hand report of the omen, Amphiaraus emphasizes Adrastus' ignorance in the field of omens, as a contrast to his own mantic skills.

---

[100] Thus Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 210).

For **ὄρνις** metaphorically referring to a 'sign, omen,' cf. καί ποτ' ἐς ἑπταπύλους Θήβας ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰσιᾶν | οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν, *N.*9.18/9 (of the Seven); κεῖνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει μεγαλᾶν πολίων | ματρόπολιν Θήραν γενέσθαι, *P.*4.19/20; καί ῥά οἱ | μάντις ὀρνίχεσσι καὶ κλάροισι θεοπροπέων ἱεροῖς | Μόψος ἄμβασε στρατὸν πρόφρων, *P.*4.189-91; *Il.*24.219, A.*fr.*95 R., Ar.*Av.*719-22. Thus also οἰωνός: *Il.*12.243, Hes.*fr.*240.11 M.-W., E.*Or.*788, etc.

The verb **ἐνέχεσθαι** (only here in Pindar) means 'to be caught, entangled'; cf., e.g., τῆι πάγηι ἐνέχεσθαι, Hdt.2.121β; ἐνέσχετό που ἐν τοῖς τῆς νεὼς σκεύεσιν, Pl.*La.*183e, etc. Frequently metaphorically for 'being caught, possessed,' by something uncomfortable (cf. Κῦρος δὲ ἀπορίηισι ἐνείχετο, Hdt.1.190) or for 'being possessed, obsessed' by something improper (cf. φιλοτιμίαι μὲν ἐνέχεται, δεινῶι κακῶι, E.*IA* 527; A.*Supp.*169, Pl.*Lg.*935c, etc.; LSJ *s.v.* cite only our place here for the verb "in good sense"). The connotations of the verb result, in combination with ἀρείονος ὄρνιχος ἀγγελία, in an *oxymoron* that is not unfunctional as a means to present Amphiaraus' point of view. In the first place, the choice of the verb helps to conjure up the first expedition which could aptly be described as having been led by Adrastus' improper obsession of sacking Thebes. Moreover, it seems not impossible that Pindar wished his audience to hear in Amphiaraus' words that he disapproved of Adrastus' obsessive ambition also in the case of the second expedition. After all, his obsession was justified only accidentally, as the ἀγγελία happens to be correct; Adrastus is still not led by true knowledge of a favourable outcoming. In blindly following the prediction of a better fate he risks going the road to destruction for the second time.

If I am right in discerning an undertone of bitterness in Amphiaraus' words, **ἥρως** could be ironical in a way comparable to καμών in 48. That Adrastus was the only one to survive, could under normal circumstances be a ground for supposing that he was an exceptionally excellent warrior, so as to qualify for being called a ἥρως. But Amphiaraus knows that Adrastus saved his skin thanks to the swiftness of his divine steed,[101] and that he did not deserve to survive in the first place. For ἥρως juxtaposed to a proper name, cf. *I.*6.25, *O.*9.9, *Od.*8.483, Thgn.711.

51-52. τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν | ἀντία πράξει

'But, with respect to what comes from his home, he will experience the opposite.' Adrastus' good fate on the battlefield contrasts his ill fate of losing his son, as the following sentence will explain. τὸ

---

[101] Ἄδραστον δὲ μόνον ἵππος διέσωσεν Ἀρείων· τοῦτον ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος ἐγέννησε Δημήτηρ εἰκασθεῖσα ἐρινύι κατὰ τὴν συνουσίαν, Apollod.3.6.8; cf. *Il.*23.346/7.

οἴκοθεν (acc.) refers to what comes from, is part of Adrastus' οἶκος,[102] which is specified in the next sentence as pertaining to his son. The particle δέ marks τὸ οἴκοθεν as a new *topic* (still under the umbrella of the hierarchically higher *topic* Adrastus): the attention shifts from Adrastus' fate on the battlefield to what will happen to him in the private sphere.

For **πράσσω** with an adverb cf. *O*.4.4, *O*.11.4, *P*.2.73, with a neuter plural in *O*.8.73. Cf. also E.*Alc*.605, *El*.1359, *IA* 346, Th.7.71.1, 8.95.6. For the digamma cf. *P*.7.5, *N*.6.25, *P*.4.294, *Pae*.4.32.

52-53. μόνος γὰρ ἐκ Δαναῶν στρατοῦ | θανόντος ὀστέα λέξαις υἱοῦ
'For he alone of the Danaans' army' will come home 'after having gathered the bones of a dead son.' As γάρ signals, this is the specified elaboration of the preceding sentence. Adrastus' son, called Aegialeus, is prophesied to be the sole casualty. While Adrastus was the only one to survive the first expedition, he is the only one to loose is son in the second. The Argive Epigonoi are **Δαναοί** in the technical (as opposed to the Homeric) sense of the word because they descend from Hypermnestra, daughter of Danaus (cf.]ἀπὸ Δανα[, *Dith*.1.1 for Argos).

In Homer the dead body is often referred to as **ὀστέα** (λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός, *Il*.12.386, 16.743, 20.406, 23.224, 23.252, *Od*.3.455, 11.221, 12.414). ὀστέα λέγειν is a traditional phase of the interment ritual (ὀστέα Πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτιάδαο λέγωμεν, *Il*.23.239; ὀστέα λευκὰ λέγοντο κασίγνητοί θ' ἑταιροί τε, *Il*.24.793; cf. *Od*.24.72).

The topsy-turvy of parents burying their sons is a traditional horror of war (cf., e.g., οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὕτω ἀνόητός ἐστι ὅστις πόλεμον ἀντ' εἰρήνης αἱρέεται· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῆι οἱ παῖδες τοὺς πατέρας θάπτουσι, ἐν δὲ τῶι οἱ πατέρες τοὺς παῖδας, Hdt.1.87).

For the phrase **μόνος ἐκ**, cf. κεῖνον μοῦνον ἐξ ἁπάντων σωθῆναι, Hdt.5.87.2. The 'partitive' genitive does not occur with μόνος in Pindar, but cf. *Il*.21.443, B.4.15, *fr*.18, S.*Aj*.511, *OC* 1250, E.*Med*.52, etc. For the 'partitive' genitive with other adjectives in Pindar see Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 117 (§§ 117/8); see further K-G II, i, pp. 401/2 (§ 421.3).

•*Word Order:* Word order of the phrase θανόντος ὀστέα λέξαις υἱοῦ lends itself perfectly for an analysis in terms of iconicity: the distance between θανόντος and υἱοῦ may be taken to mirror the dispersed state Aegialeus was in after the funeral rituals. However, such an analysis would reflect a sensitive interpretation of a close reader more than it describes the linear perception of a listening audience.

[102] τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον ἐναντίως πράξει, Σ.68a (II 213 Dr.). 'As to his household,' Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 330). For the phrase cf. τῶν οἴκοθεν, E.*IA* 1000; περὶ τῶν οἴκοι, X.*Cyr*.6.1.43; τὰν οἴκωι, A.*Ch*.579.

A pragmatic analysis brings to light the climactic arrangement of the clause. The postponement of υἱοῦ drives home the full horror: Adrastus was to lose his own son.

53. τύχαι θεῶν

The placement of this phrase[103] makes it doubly applicable. It can equally well be taken with the preceding participle clause as with the following main clause. The latter option seems at first sight preferable: that Adrastus will return home with his whole army intact is the favourable part of the prophecy. However, taking into account Amphiaraus' past experiences with Adrastus, one can imagine him to be so bitter as to qualify Adrastus' ill fate, from his own perspective, as a favour of the gods.

54. ἀφίξεται λαῶι cὺν ἀβλαβεῖ

'With his whole army intact' specifies μόνοc (52) and makes explicit that Aegialeus was the sole casualty. For the expression cf. τόνδε λαὸν ἀβλαβῆ νέμων, *O.*13.27.

Epode Γ

55. Ἄβαντοc εὐρυχόρουc ἀγυιάc

'The broad lanes of Abas,' i.e., Argos. Abas was a king of Argos; he was Adrastus' grandfather. Cf. *Dith.*1.7-9. The 'streets broad for dancing' evoke associations of a triumphant return after the victory, which contrasts sharply to Adrastus' personal loss. The defeated contestants in 86 hide away in dark little back-streets.

For **ἄγυια**, 'avenue,' cf. ὃ δ' ἀπέccυτο δώματοc Ἕκτωρ | τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν αὖτιc ἐϋκτιμέναc κατ' ἀγυιάc. | εὖτε πύλαc ἵκανε διερχόμενοc μέγα ἄcτυ κτλ., *Il.*6.390-2; οὐδ' Ἀΐδαc ἀκινήταν ἔχε ῥαβδον, | βρότεα cώμαθ' ἇι κατάγει κοίλαν πρὸc ἄγυιαν | θναιcκόντων, *O.*9.33-5; εὐτυχῶc | ναίειν πατρὶ Cωγένηc ἀταλὸν ἀμφέπων | θυμὸν προγόνων ἐϋκτήμονα ζαθέαν ἄγυιαν, *N.*7.90-2; καὶ πολυκλείταν περ ἐοῖcαν ὅμωc Θῆβαν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπαcκήcει θεῶν | καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγυιάc, *fr.*194.4/5. The plural can be used metaphorically (for the 'augmentative Plural' see Schwyzer 2, p. 43) to refer to a city: λευκίπποιcι Καδμείων μετοικήcαιc ἀγυιαῖc, *P.*9.83, i.e. Thebes; πρύτανι κύριε πολλᾶν μὲν εὐcτεφάνων ἀγυιᾶν καὶ cτρατοῦ, *P.*2.58 (*sc.* Hieron), where εὐcτεφάνων makes clear that the reference is to cities (cf. *O.*8.32). Cf. also *Il.*5.642, *Od.*2.388, 3.487, 11.12, B.9.52, 11.57/8, etc. See further Maehler on B.9.52 (I.ii, p. 166).

---

[103] For the phrase cf. *O.*8.67, *N.*4.7, *N.*6.24, *P.*2.56; see further my note on *N.*5.48 (p. 178).

For the adjective cf. Ἀσίας εὐρυχόρου, *O.*7.18; Λιβύας | εὐρυχόρου, *P.*4.42/3; εὐρυχόρου ... Σπάρτας, *N.*10.52. In none of these passages the connotation of 'dancing' seems functional in the context. See Verdenius on *O.*7.18 (pp. 54/5). Cf. also the Homeric epithet εὐρυάγυια (*Il.*2.329, *Od.*15.384).

55-60

Thus spoke Amphiaraus. Rejoicing also myself, I throw crowns at Alcmaeon; I sprinkle him with song too, because, as my neighbour and guardian of my possessions, he encountered me going to the songful navel of the earth, and he grasped hold of prophecies with his inborn arts.

55-56. τοιαῦτα μὲν | ἐφθέγξατ' Ἀμφιάρηος

Amphiaraus was introduced in 39 as Οἰκλέος παῖς. Only here, at the very end of the myth, his name is mentioned. This order of information release, from veiled to specific, is not uncommon in Pindar (see my note on 39/40 above, p. 527). The particle **μέν** is balanced by δέ in 56. The μέν clause closes off the preceding section, viz. Amphiaraus' speech. The δέ clause, here, introduces a first person statement of the poet saying that he himself consents with the tenor of the speech of the character he has just portrayed. For transition-marking by means of μέν ... δέ see Bakker, *SIL* 17, 1993, 302/3. See further below. For the variation in opening and closing cappings of direct speech see my note on line 43 above (p. 531).

55-60. Alcmaeon's Epiphany to Pindar

This passage comes as a kind of 'coda' after the myth. A transition is made from the heroic past to the present; Alcmaeon, who featured in the myth, becomes the *topic* of the following section. He is dealt with from the poet's personal perspective. For the extemporizing fiction in this transition see my following note. The passage is generally taken as referring to an epiphany of Alcmaeon, who, on that occasion, made a prophecy, the content of which is not given; he inherited his abilities to do so from his father Amphiaraus. Depending on the reference of the first person in this passage, there are two possibilites.

(1) The first person refers to the poet. Pindar characterizes Alcmaeon as his 'neighbour' and as the 'guardian of his possessions,' which must imply that Alcmaeon had a shrine in or near Thebes,[104] used for depositing goods. Pindar 'encountered' Alcmaeon while he

---

[104] Some have argued that Pindar refers to Alcmaeon's shrine in Argos, on the basis of the idea that Pindar spent the last days of his life in that city. See Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 441; cf. Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 213 with n. 3.

was travelling from Thebes to Delphi, which means that he saw him as a vision in a dream[105] or as a waking epiphany,[106] possibly when passing his shrine, or that he saw his statue at Delphi.[107] Alcmaeon revealed a prophecy to the poet, the content of which is not given.

(2) The chorus are speaking in the persona of the victor,[108] which implies that Alcmaeon had a shrine in Aegina, possibly close to Aristomenes' house, which was used for depositing goods. And apparently Alcmaeon had appeared to Aristomenes, in one way or the other, making a prophecy, probably about his victory.[109] This interpretation is highly unlikely. There are no parallels for the chorus speaking in the persona of the victor, which is hardly surprising since such a use of first person utterances would result in intolerable obscurity.[110] One of the accomplishments of Mary Lefkowitz' studies

---

[105] Thus Dissen *ad loc.*; Mezger *ad loc.*; Drachmann, *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi* 3.1, 1892/3, 162; Schroeder *ad loc.*; Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 441; Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 189; Puech *ad loc.;* Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 577, drawing attention to the tradition that in the Amphiareon oracles were delivered in dreams).

[106] Norwood, *Pindar*, p. 4; Burton, *Pythian Odes*, pp. 182/3, Bowra, *Pindar*, 52; Ruck & Matheson, p. 101; Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 304).

[107] Fennell (*ad loc.*) thinks it was a shrine. Boeckh (*ad loc*) thinks it was either a shrine or a statue. Gildersleeve (*ad loc.*) does not speculate about the precise nature of Alcmaeon's appearance. The activity on the part of Alcmaeon, implied by his being subject and agens of the verb, seems to plead against the idea of a statue.

[108] That the chorus are speaking in their own persona seems to be implied by Σ. 83a (II 215 Dr., on κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν): ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ Αἰγινηταί εἰcιν. Thus C.O. Pavese, 'La Pitica VIII di Pindaro', *Studi di filologia classica in honore di Giusto Monaco* I, Palermo 1991, 143-153, esp. p. 150; cf. Gentili, *AuA* 36, 1990, 1-17, esp. p. 15 n. 72, and *Pitiche*, p. 213; D'Alessio, *BICS* 39, 1994, 117-39, esp. pp. 135/6. This means that Alcmaeon had a shrine in Aegina, which was used for depositing goods. This interpretation has the quite unlikely implication that the chorus had traveled to Delphi and that they experienced some collective hallucination on their way. Thus Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 576). Referring the first person to the chorus leader (Studniczka, *Cyrene*) is also implausible. "As though Pindar would allow the choragos to intervene and tell us where he banked his property!" Farnell *ad loc.* (II, p. 195).

[109] Thus Σ. 78a (II 214 Dr.): ὡc ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ τὸ πρόcωπον μιμουμένου τοῦ νενικηκότοc. ταῦτα δὲ εἴρηκεν ὡc ὑπάρχοντοc ἡρώιου καὶ γειτῶντοc τῆι τοῦ νικηφόρου οἰκίαι, προcυποτίθεται δὲ ὅτι καὶ ὑπήντηcε πορευομένωι εἰc τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τῆc μαντείαc ἐγήψατο καὶ αὐτὸc ὢν μάντιc. ἐμφαίνει δὲ διὰ τούτων ὅτι ἐγεγόνει τιc μαντεία περὶ τῆc νίκηc αὐτοῦ, and Σ. 80 (II 214 Dr.): τῆι Ἀριcτομένουc οἰκίαι παρίδρυτο Ἀλκμάονοc ἡρώιον, ἴcωc δὲ καὶ τῆι αὐτοῦ μαντείαι χρηcάμενοc ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἐνίκηcεν, followed by Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, p. 84; Thummer, *Religiosität*, 32; Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, II, pp 69/70; Floyd, *GRBS* 6, 1965, 187-200; Slater, *GRBS* 12, 1971, 141, and *Arktouros*, pp. 68-70. Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 576) does not exclude this interpretation. The scholiast's claim is parallelled by the scholion on *P.*9.91 (161, II 236 Dr.) which takes the passage in question as spoken by the victor; see also Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al, Pitiche*, p. 612). Similarly, the idea of a chorus speaking in the persona of the victor has been suggested for *I.*7.40-4. See Σ. 55b; see Young, *Isthmian 7*, pp. 29/30 with n. 99. the scholiast on *I.*7.55b takes the first person utterance as spoken by the victor.

[110] Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 194 n. 3. Thus also Robbins, *Companion*, p. 269:

in this field (especially her essays collected in *First Person Fictions*) is that there can now be little doubt that first person utterances in the victory odes refer to the poet.[111]

Recently, Hubbard, 'The Theban Amphiaraion and Pindar's Vision on the Road to Delphi', *MH* 50, 1993, 193-203, argued extensively against both interpretations. He points out that there is no evidence for a cult of Alcmaeon in Thebes (or in Aegina, for that matter), which makes Pindar's reference to Alcmaeon as his γείτων rather problematic. He argues that Alcmaeon is moreover unlikely to have had a cult in Thebes: "Greek hero cults are almost always connected with claims to being the site of a hero's death and burial";[112] Alcmaeon was "an enemy of Thebes who never returned to the city after destroying it" (p. 195). Another problem is that there is no evidence of Alcmaeon having an oracle anywhere in Greece or even oracular powers.[113] Hubbard scrutinizes Alcmaeon's biography and concludes that "the many myths surrounding Alcmeon all make it quite clear that he did not possess the ability to foresee the future" (p. 195) and that "in the context of this mythological background, it is inconceivable either that Pindar would allude in passing to Alcmeon's 'inborn arts of prophecy' or that Pindar's audience could be expected to understand such an allusion" (p. 196). Moreover, Hubbard perceives a "confusion involved in positing two separate hypotheticals—the shrine supposedly within Thebes and the apparition on the road to Delphi" (p. 203).

Hubbard's proposal is to follow Σ. 78b (II 214 Dr.)[114] and to take not Alcmaeon but Amphiaraus to be the hero who appeared to Pindar.[115] The advantages of this are evident: Amphiaraus' mantic abilities are well attested; he has in fact just demonstrated them. He had a well-known oracle near Thebes (cf. esp. Hdt.1.46, 49, 52, 92, 8.134), which makes γείτων understandable (cf. *I.*1.53), on the road to Potniae (Paus.9.8.3, cf. Strab.9.1.22), which would indeed be on the route from Thebes to Delphi (further details are to be found in Hubbard, p.

"without an indicator in the poem that there is an assumed voice, we would do best to abandon this proposal."

[111] See further Robbins, *Companion*, pp. 269/70 with nn. 55-8; further references are to be found therein.

[112] See also Rohde, *Psyche*, pp. 121-4, 134. Paus.8.24.7 saw Alcmaeon's grave and a grove sacred to him in Psophis.

[113] Clemens Al.*Strom.*I p. 224 D says that Alcmaeon (instead of Amphilochus) had an oracle in Acarnia; Rohde (p. 189) regards this as a "Flüchtigkeitsversehen". Even if Rohde is wrong, any connection with Thebes (or Aegina) is absent.

[114] ἐφηδόμενος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν Ἀλκμάονα στεφανῶ τῆι ὠιδῆι, ὅτι δή μοι ὁ τούτου πατὴρ Ἀμφιάραος γείτων ἐστὶ καὶ φύλαξ τῶν ἐμῶν κτημάτων, καὶ ὅτι ἀπιόντι εἰς τὸν τῆς γῆς ὀμφαλόν, τουτέστι εἰς τὴν Πυθῶνα, ἀπήντησε καὶ τῶν μαντευμάτων ἐφήψατο τοῖς συγγενηθεῖσιν αὐτῶι τυχὸν [δὲ λέγει συγγόνοις τέχναις].

[115] Hubbard is followed by D'Alessio, *BICS* 39, 1994, 135 n. 60.

196 with nn. 14-6). "By identifying the 'neighbor and guardian' as the Amphiaraion in the vicinity of Thebes, located along the road to Delphi, we can unite the two elements that are awkwardly separate in the traditional interpretation of this passage—the neighboring shrine and the vision on the road to Delphi" (Hubbard, p. 197).

Unfortunately, this attractive interpretation founders on Pindar's syntax. The internal structure of the sentence requires that the ὅτι clause provides the reason why Alcmaeon deserves to be praised. It is difficult to see the logic in 'I too praise Alcmaeon, because I met Amphiaraus.'[116] Any signal preventing one from identifying the subject of the ὅτι clause with the *topic* of its matrix clause, viz. Alcmaeon, is lacking. Taking Alcmaeon as the γείτων is the only conceivable construction of the Greek.

Of course Hubbard (pp. 199/200) is right in stating (against Lefkowitz, *CPh* 70, 1975, 180 = *First Person Fictions*, p. 82) that "no principle of Greek grammar dictates that the subject of a subordinate clause must be a person named in the main clause of the sentence" (p. 199). But that is besides the point. What makes the *topic* switch inconceivable here is the information status of the ὅτι clause. 'I too praise Alcmaeon, because' raises the expectation on the part of the hearer that a reason will be given why Alcmaeon deserves to be praised. It is the informational structure of the sentence that guides the hearer to taking the *topic* to be continuous. Therefore, the "close syntactical analogue" adduced by Hubbard (p. 199) is in fact an entirely different case: in καὶ τότε γνοὺϲ Ἴϲχυοϲ Εἰλατίδα | ξεινίαν κοίταν ἄθεμίν τε δόλον, πέμψεν καϲιγνήταν μένει | θυίοιϲαν ἀμαιμακέτωι | ἐϲ Λακέρειαν, ἐπεὶ παρὰ Βοιβιάδοϲ κρημνοῖϲιν ὤικει παρθένοϲ, *P.*3.31-4, the ἐπεί clause provides information explaining why Apollo sent Artemis to Laceria, identifying it as the place where Coronis dwelt. There is nothing problematic about the *topic* switch here because the hearer does not expect more information about Artemis; he expects information that links the location mentioned to Coronis. The other parallels given by Hubbard (p. 200 n. 27) are not comparable to *h.l.* either: In Ἀρτέμιδοϲ, ἆϲ οὐκ ἄτερ | κείναϲ ἀγαναῖϲιν ἐν χερϲὶ ποικιλανίουϲ ἐδάμαϲϲε πώλουϲ (*sc.* Hieron). ἐπὶ γὰρ ἰοχέαιρα παρθένοϲ χερὶ διδύμαι | ὅ τ' ἐναγώνιοϲ Ἑρμᾶϲ αἰγλάεντα τίθηϲι κόϲμον, ξεϲτὸν ὅταν δίφρον | ἔν θ' ἅρματα πειϲιχάλινα καταζευγνύηι | ϲθένοϲ ἵππιον, *P.*2.7-12, the sentence introduced by γάρ elaborates upon the preceding statement that Hieron won with the help of Artemis, so that the informational structure of the sentence requires that Hieron is the subject of the ὅταν clause. In ἐνυπνίωι δ' ἆι τάχιϲτα πιθέϲθαι | κελήϲατό νιν, ὅταν δ' εὐρυϲθενεῖ | καρταίποδ' ἀναρύηι Γαιαόχωι, | θέμεν Ἱππίαι βωμὸν εὐθὺϲ Ἀθάναι, *O.*13.79-82, the ὅταν clause is part of the advice given in the accusative with infinitive construction; the subject of the ὅταν clause is identical to the subject of the a.c.i.

---

[116] Thus also Robbins, *Companion*, p. 273.

Pindar's syntax leaves us no choice but to take Alcmaeon as the subject of the ὅτι clause; because the first person must refer to the poet, the traditional interpretation (1) of the passage must be correct: it describes an encounter between the poet and the dead hero Alcmaeon on the road to Delphi. Whether this was a dream or an epiphany cannot be determined and is unimportant. The most natural, literal interpretation of γείτων ... μοι (58) is that Alcmaeon had a shrine in or near Thebes; κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν (58) can hardly mean anything else than that Pindar had deposited something there for security. That there is no evidence for a cult of Alcmaeon in or near Thebes is annoying. But we have no choice but to take Pindar's word for it. Possibly the shrine was the spot were the epiphany occurred to the poet, but because we do not know where the shrine was, we cannot be sure whether it was on the route from Thebes to Delphi. Perhaps the well-known Amphiaraeon in the vicinity of Thebes, along the road to Delphi, was a place where one could encounter Amphiaraus' son, although there is no evidence to confirm that.[117] When Pindar met with Alcmaeon, the hero gave him a prophecy, the content of which is not given. That the mythological tradition does not associate Alcmaeon with the capacity for prophetic foresight is less problematic than Hubbard believes. If Pindar's vision was real—and why should it not be—, the experience would naturally overrule any tradition. Actually hearing a prophecy out of Alcmaeon's mouth is perfectly adequate proof of his mantic abilities, even if it were the first and last time he displayed them. Moreover, Pindar tells us what he sees as the the source of Alcmaeon's abilities: cυγγόνοιcι τέχναιc (60) makes clear that he has inherited his capacity of foresight from his father. Alcmaeon's mantic abilities are hinted at by the mention of his snake emblem on his shield (46, see my note *ad loc.*).

Thematically, this passage about Alcmaeon's epiphany ties in with the general purpose of the myth. The context makes explicit that the poet's intention in introducing Amphiaraus' speech with its narrative setting is to draw a complimentary analogy between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence. By referring to Alcmaeon's mantic abilities and by explicitly connecting them with 'inherited skills' (60), the 'coda' emphasises again that the power of inherited excellence is the *tertium comparationis* between Aristomenes and Alcmaeon.[118] The very occur-

---

[117] Robbins, *Companion*, p. 272, observes that "Amphiaraus' oracle was forbidden to native Thebans (Hdt.8.134)."

[118] See also Miller, *CJ* 89, 1993, 32 n. 22. For Amphiaraus' double excellence cf. also *O*.6.17.

rence of the epiphany underscores the parallel too: an epiphany of Amphiaraus has been related in the preceding passage; now we have an epiphany of his son. Moreover, the myth and this 'coda' present two contrasting sides of Alcmaeon. Amphiaraus' speech portrays him as a fierce warrior (46-7), the coda shows him from a gentle side,—a two-sidedness that ties in with a number of comparable double personalities in this ode. See further my interpretation, pp. 441/2, 448, 453.

In sum, the reality this passage refers to may be alien to the modern reader's experiences, and it may be troubling scholars because it cannot be confirmed by independent evidence; but, since the text unequivocally refers to this reality, such problems are in the end unsubstantial. The question as to why Pindar bothers to include in this epinicion a reference to such a personal experience is answered by the thematic approriateness of the passage: it demonstrates the power of inherited excellence; and it illustrates contrasting behaviours in contrasting situations. This leaves us with the question as to why Pindar tells us that Alcmaeon made a prophecy, while not bothering to tell us what it was about. For an answer to this question see interpretation, pp 440/1 above.

56. χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς

'Also myself rejoicing.' By virtue of dissociating αὐτός from the preceding subject, καί signals at the outset of the sentence that Amphiaraus is not the subject of χαίρων, nor, consequently, of the main verb that is to follow. καί underscores the parallelism between Pindar's rejoicing and praising Alcmaeon and the general purport of Amphiaraus' speech (44-55). It has been noted that lines 48-55 do not bear on the analogy between the victor and Alcmaeon as exemplifications of the power of inherited excellence, nor is 'praise of Alcmaeon' a suitable label for it.[119] As Andrew Miller has demonstrated (*CJ* 89, 1993, 31-4), the irrelevance of lines 48-55 to the avowed aim of 44-55 is yet another example of Pindar's familiar fictive mimesis of spontaneous text production. See my note on 38 λόγον, pp. 523/4, and introduction, pp. 34-7. "Although it is usually the case, when the 'I' of a Pindaric ode strays from an intended point or program, that he explicitly calls attention to the divagation as a means of redirecting himself to the matter at hand (*P.*11.38ff. being perhaps the most notorious example), the patterns and habits of ordinary speech offer another method of dealing with such a mo-

[119] See, e.g., Boeckh *ad loc.* (p. 311); Drachmann, *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*, p. 325; Christ *ad loc.* (p. 198); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 182.

mentary lapse in concentration, which is simply to disregard the fact that it has occurred and hope that one's auditors will do the same. ... In saying 'Like Amphiaraos, I too praise Alkmaion,' the speaker either flatly ignores the last eight lines of the speech he has just reported or blithely pretends that they are no less relevant to (and laudatory of) Alkmaion than the first four," Miller, pp. 33/4.

57. Ἀλκμᾶνα στεφάνοιcι βάλλω

The poet gives Alcmaeon the treatment that befits a victor in the Games, a procedure that emphasizes the parallel between Alcmaeon and the present victor, Aristomenes. See interpretation, pp. 436-42. The present tense verbs, βάλλω and ῥαίνω, are performative. The poet metaphorically crowns Alcmaeon and literally adorns him with song as he speaks.

For the φυλλοβολία, cf. πολέες δ' ἀμφ' Ἀλεξ[ίδα]μον ἀνθέων | ἐν πεδίωι στέφανοι Κίρρας ἔπεσον κρατερᾶς ἦρα παννικοι⟨ο⟩ πάλας, B.11.17-21; πολλὰ κεν κεῖνοι δίκον | φύλλ' ἔπι καὶ στεφάνους, *P.* 9.123/4; ἔκτος οἷς ἤδη στέφανος περίκειται φυλλοφόρων ἀπ' ἀγώνων, *O.*8.76; cf. also στεφάνοιcί τε νιν ποίας ἔρεπτον, *P.*4.240. See further Eratosthenes *FGrHist* 241 F 14 (= Σ. *ad* E.*Hec.*574), Clem.Alex. *Paedag.*2.8.72 (p. 201 St.), Paus.6.7.1. See also M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin & New York 1982, pp. 112/3 with n. 17.

57. ῥαίνω δὲ καὶ ὕμνωι

'And I sprinkle him with song as well.' For the metaphor cf. ὔμμε τ' ... | τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ σαφέστατον ἔμμεν | τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις, *I.*6.19-21; μεγαλᾶν δ' ἀρετᾶν | δρόσωι μαλθακᾶι | ῥανθεισᾶν κώμων ὑπὸ χεύμασιν, *P.*5.98-100; σὺν Ὀρσέαι δέ νιν | κωμάξομαι τερπνὰν ἐπιστάζων χάριν, *I.*4.73/4; τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ πάτραν Χαρίτων | ἄρδοντι καλλίσται δρόσωι, *I.*6.63/4; ἄρδοντ' ἀοιδαῖς, *fr.*6b(f); σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον, | ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων | κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω, *N.*7.61-3; cf. also οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω | λόγον, *O.*4.17/8 (with Mader *ad loc.*, pp. 50/1); χέων ῥαθά[μιγ]γα, *Pae.*7.9. As εἴη δὲ τρίτον (*sc.* κρατῆρα) | σωτῆρι πορσαίνοντας Ὀλυμπίωι Αἴγιναν κάτα | σπένδειν μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδαῖς, *I.*6.7-9, suggests, these metaphors can be compared to more elaborated passages presenting the victory ode with a drink (see *N.*3.76-9 with my notes *ad loc.*, pp. 398/9). For the combination of crown and song cf. *I.*5.62/3, *O.*11.13/4, etc.

• *Coordination:* **δέ** articulates this phrase as a next independent step in the sequence, coordinating ῥαίνω and the preceding βάλλω. **καί** marks the hymn as being in addition to the crowns just mentioned.

58. γείτων ... καὶ κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν

Pindar characterizes Alcmaeon as his 'neighbour and guardian of his possessions.' The most natural, literal interpretation of this is that Alcmaeon was associated with a place in or near Thebes, Pindar's home town, probably because he had a shrine there, and that the poet had deposited something there for safety.[120] See my general note on this passage above.

In Pindar, **γείτων**, 'neighbour' (cf. *O.*1.47), is often used metaphorically, the denotation 'person living next door' having been excluded in favour of the connotation of vicinity.

Cf. ὄρος, εὐκάρποιο γαίας μέτωπον, τοῦ μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν | κλεινὸς οἰκιστὴρ ἐκύδανεν πόλιν | γείτονα, *P.*1.30-2, of the city of Aetna lying near the mountain; πολλὰ μὲν ἐν κονίαι χέρσωι, τὰ δὲ γείτονι πόντωι φάσομαι, *N.*9.43, in Sicily and off Cumae; ἄμμι δ' ἔοικε Κρόνου σεισίχθον' υἱὸν | γείτον' ... κελαδῆσαι, *I.*1.52-4, of Poseidon of Onchestus being a 'neighbour' of Thebes;[121] ἔσχον δ' Ἀμύκλας ὄλβιοι | ... λευκοπώλων Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι γείτονες, *P.*1.65/6, *sc.* Δωριεῖς: "Amyklai is near Therapnai, centre of their cult" (Slater *s.v.*).

These passages show that Alcmaeon's shrine was not necessarily next door to Pindar, or even in Thebes (as the temple of the Magna Mater mentioned in *P.*3.78).[122] If one wishes to think of the Amphiaraeon near Potniae as a place where one could encounter Amphiaraus' son, the place would be close enough to Thebes for γείτων to refer to it.

γείτων may evoke connotations of mutual benevolence between neighbours. Cf. εἰ δὲ γεύται | ἀνδρὸς ἀνήρ τι, φαῖμέν κε γείτον' ἔμμεναι | νόωι φιλήσαντ' ἀτενέϊ γείτονι χάρμα πάντων ἐπάξιον, *N.*7.86-9. For the protective neighbourship of a divinity cf. Ὄγκα Παλλάς, ... ἀγχίπτολις | πύλαισι γείτων, A.*Th.*501/2. These connotations emphasize the friendly nature of Alcmaeon's encounter with Pindar, which is functional as a contrast to his portrayal as a fierce warrior above (46-7).[123] See further my next note.

For a divine **φύλαξ** cf. ὦ Πάν, ... | ... σεμνῶν ἀδύτων φύλαξ, *fr.*95.1/2.

58-59. ὅτι μοι ... | ὑπάντασεν ἰόντι γᾶς ὀμφαλὸν παρ' ἀοίδιμον

Alcmaeon encountered the poet on his way from Thebes to Delphi. This must refer to an epiphany (see my general note on this passage

[120] "'Hüter seines Besitzes' kann er genannt werden entweder nur als Schutzgeist seiner Nachbarn, oder weil Pindar Gelder in seinem Heiligthum deponirt hatte, nach bekannter Sitte (Büchsenschütz, *Besitz und Erwerb im classischen Alterthum*, pp. 508ff)," Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 189. Cf. Gildersleeve *ad loc.*

[121] See Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 197, and the literature cited in n. 17.

[122] See Rusten, *HSCPh* 87, 1983, 289-297; Gentili *ad loc.* (*Pitiche*, pp. 415/6).

[123] Thus Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 213.

above). As often, there is an interaction between 'roads' and 'journeys' the poet refers to in his text and the thematic direction of his text (cf., e.g., *N.*3.26/7 with my notes, pp. 302/3). On the level of the poet's thematic procedures, too, we meet Alcmaeon (56-60) on our own road from Thebes (the scene of lines 39-56) to Delphi (61-65).

The **γᾶς ὀμφαλός** is the centre point of the earth in Delphi, marked by a conical stone. It can metaphorically refer to the Apollo temple, where the stone stood, or to Delphi as a whole.[124]

Cf. πὰρ μέϲον ὀμφαλὸν εὐδένδροιο ... ματέροϲ, *P.*4.74; ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου | χθόνοϲ ἐϲ ναΐον, *P.*6.3/4; ὀρθοδίκαν | γᾶϲ ὀμφαλόν, *P.*11.9/10; παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου | ... χθονόϲ, *N.*7.33/4; χθονὸϲ ὀμφαλὸν παρὰ ϲκιάεντα, *Pae.*6.17; γᾶϲ παρ' ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύν, *Pae.*6.120; παρ' [ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονόϲ, B.4.4. Cf. further A.*Eu.*40, 166, S.*OT* 898, E.*Med.*668, E.*Ion* 5, 223, Pl.*R.*427c. καὶ ἐκάλεϲεν τῆϲ γῆϲ ὀμφαλόν, προϲπλάϲαντεϲ καὶ μῦθον, ὅν φηϲι Πίνδαροϲ, ὅτι ϲυμπέϲοιεν ἐνταῦτα οἱ αἰετοὶ οἱ ἀφεθέντεϲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Διόϲ, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆϲ δύϲεωϲ, ὁ δ' ἀπὸ τῆϲ ἀνατολῆϲ, Strab.9.3.6 (419 = Pi.*fr.*54); cf. Paus.10.16.3.

On the omphalos see further: W.H. Roscher, 'Omphalos', *ASG* 29, 1913, 54-105; 'Neue Omphalosstudien', *ASG* 31, 1915; 'Der Omphalos-gedanke', *BSG* 70, 1918; H.-V. Herrmann, *Omphalos*, Münster 1959; F. Courby, *Fouilles de Delphes II: La terasse du temple*, Paris 1927, 69-78, figs. 64-9; F. Schrober, *RE* Suppl.5, 123/4.; Braswell on *P.*4.74 (p. 168).

The adjective **ἀοίδιμοϲ** associates the notion it qualifies with song.

In πόμ' ἀοίδιμον, *N.*3.79, the adjective refers to the *suppressed tenor* of the metaphor (see my note *ad loc.*, p. 408). Elsewhere, the association with song may reside in that the notion qualified sings (as in ἀοίδιμοι βαϲίλειαι | Χάριτεϲ, *O.*14.3/4, cf. 13-8; ἐν ζαθέωι με δέξαι χρόνωι ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν, *Pae.*6.6), or in that it is sung about (as in ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοϲτέφανοι καὶ ἀοίδιμοι ... κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι, *fr.*76; in *Il.*6.357/8 Helena says that the gods have brought misery over herself and Paris ὡϲ καὶ ὀπίϲϲω | ἀνθρώποιϲι πελώμεθ' ἀοίδιμοι ἐϲϲομένοιϲιν, where they will be ἀοίδιμοι because they will be the subject-matter of future songs[125]; cf. also Λίνοϲ, ὅϲ περ ἔν τε Φοινίκηι ἀοίδιμόϲ ἐϲτι καὶ ἐν Κύπρωι καὶ ἄλληι, Hdt.2.79). In Cφίγγεϲ ὄνυξιν ἀοίδιμον ἄγραν φέρουϲαι, E.*El.*471, the Sphinxes' victims are ἀοίδιμοι since they have become victimes because of the Sphinxes' riddles ('the prey won their songs', Denniston *ad loc.*; cf. E.*Ph.*50, 808, 1507, S.*OT* 36, 130).

Here, the association of the earth's centre point with song may derive its relevance both from the fact that Delphi is frequently 'sung

[124] Farnell (II p. 403) suggested that ὀμφαλόϲ can be a metaphor for Delphi. Radt, *Sweiter und sechster Paian*, pp. 118-20 (on *Pae.*6.17), insists that it specifically refers to the Apollo temple in all the Pindaric occurrences of the noun.

[125] Cf. εἰπὲ δ', ὅ τι κλαίειϲ καὶ ὀδύρεαι ἔνδοθι θυμῶι | Ἀργείων Δαναῶν ἠδ' Ἰλίου οἶτον ἀκούων. | τὸν δὲ θεοὶ μὲν τεῦξαν, ἐπεκλώϲαντο δ' ὄλεθρον | ἀνθρώποιϲ, ἵνα ἦϲι καὶ ἐϲϲομένοιϲιν ἀοιδή, *Od.*8.577-80.

about' (with the association that it is famous) and from its being the home of the Pythia, who delivered oracles in verse.[126] The same adjective is given to Apollo's temple in Delphi in ἀμφὶ δὲ νηὸν ἔνασσαν ἀθέσφατα φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων | κτιστοῖσιν λάεσσι ἀοίδιμον ἔμμεναι αἰεί, *h.Ap.*298/9, where it has the same double relevance. Here the adjective has the additional effect of associating prophecy with Pindar's own activity.[127]

For the verb **ὑπαντάω** see my note on 11 above (pp. 484/5). For the verbal echo ὑπάντασεν (59) ~ ὑπαντιάξαισα (11) see interpretation p. 441.

60. μαντευμάτων τ' ἐφάψατο συγγόνοισι τέχναις

'And he grasped hold of prophecies with his inborn arts'. συγγόνοισι τέχναις makes clear that he has inherited his capacity of foresight from his father.[128] For the thematic importance of the power of inherited excellence see my general note above.

Since **ἐφάπτομαι** can be construed with a genitive (cf. *O.*9.12, *N.*9.47) as well as with a dative complement (cf. *O.*1.86, *N.*8.36), one could theoretically interpret this line as 'and he grasped hold of his inborn arts of prophecies.'[129] Word order, however, pleads strongly against this interpretation. A hearer would, after having heard the genitive, naturally construe it with the verb as he hears it (the sentence could syntactically be complete at this stage), rather than saving up the genitive, leaving the verb without a complement untill the very last word of the sentence and then construing the genitive with that.[130] For the 'touching' metaphor see my introduction pp. 30/1.

Lefkowitz, *CPh* 70, 1975, 183, and *First Person Fictions*, p. 81, translates this line as 'touched me with his inherited skills of prophecies,' supplying μοι from line 58 as the complement to ἐφάψατο. This is unlikely. It is unnatural to supply a notion from the context as a complement while in fact two nouns are available to perform this function in the sentence itself. Moreover, what case would the supplied 'me' have to be in this sentence? There are no parallels for ἐφάπτομαι with a double dative con-

---

[126] Or, whose utterances were interpreted into verse by the priests. See Dodds, *Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 92 n. 70.

[127] Cf. Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 198 with n. 22. For the association of poetry with prophecy cf., e.g., Democr.*fr.*18 DK, Pl.*Ap.*22b/c, *Ion* 533e; cf. also *fr.*150.

[128] The entire family (including Melampus, Antiphates, Oicles, Amphiaraus, and Polyphides) was blessed with prophetic skills. Cf. esp. *Od.*15.223-55; cf. also Hes.*fr.*25.34-40 M.-W., Apollod.3.6.2.

[129] Thus Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 220.

[130] Hubbard's argument against this interpretation, "συγγόνοισι τέχναις are by definition already within a person and thus not something one would 'take hold of'" (*MH* 50, 1993, 193 n. 1), is not entirely fair. It disregards the possibilty of ἐφάψατο imparting metaphorically that Alcmaeon 'used' his inborn skills.

struction, meaning 'touch someone with something'; supplying μου would result in intolerable ambiguity due to the presence of two genitives having a different function. See also Hubbard, *MH* 50, 1993, 193 n. 1.

For **μάντευμα** cf. *P.*4.73, *P.*5.62, *I.*7.14/5, *Pae.*7.1.

Strophe Δ

61-66

You, Far-Shooter, who govern the all welcoming renowned temple in the valley of Pytho, you have granted there the greatest of joys, and at home, previously, you brought him the coveted gift of the Pentathlon at your feasts.

61. τὺ δ', ἑκαταβόλε

Address to Apollo, the deity presiding over the Pythian Games, where Aristomenes has won his victory that is celebrated by this ode. The invocation is followed by a reference to his temple (61-3), which both defines in which capacity the deity is being invoked, and glorifies him, and to the past favours he has bestowed upon the victor (64-6). In 67-9 the actual prayer follows. The particle δ', preceded by the personal pronoun τύ, signals *topic shift* (cf. ὁ δέ, 49; contrast τὺ δ' 8, with my note, p. 479). The abruptness of the transition is soothened by the reference to Delphi in 59, a technique that is comparable to the transition at the beginning of the second triad, where Δωριεῖ at the end of the first triad (20) prepares for the transition to Aegina.

ἑκαταβόλος (ἑκάβολος/ἑκήβολος) is a fixed epithet of Apollo (*P.*9.38, *Pae.*6.79, 111, *fr.*22, 140a.61, *Il.*1.14, 96, 370, 5.444, 15.231, 16.711, *Od.*8.339, etc.).

*O.*9.5-12 is the exception: ἀλλὰ νῦν ἑκαταβόλων Μοιcᾶν ἀπὸ τόξων | Δία τε φοινικοςτερόπαν cεμνόν τ' ἐπίνειμαι | ἀκρωτήριον Ἄλιδος | τοιοῖcδε βέλεccιν, | τὸ δή ποτε Λυδὸc ἥρωc Πέλοψ | ἐξάρατο κάλλιcτον ἕδνον Ἱπποδαμείαc· | πτερόεντα δ' ἵει γλυκὺν | Πυθῶνάδ' ὀιcτόν· οὔτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψεαι. Word order strongly pleads in favour of the scholiast's connection of ἑκαταβόλων with Μοιcᾶν.[131] The Muses are 'far-shooting' in this particular context, because the words they provide or inspire are compared to arrows. The association with Apollo that the epithet evokes is functional. Bow and lyre are united in the person of Apollo.[132] Both aspects of Apollo represent the *vehicle* and the *tenor* of the passage respectively. The genitive adjunct ἑκαταβόλων Μοιcᾶν to τόξων partly soothens the metaphor, because Μοιcᾶν explicitly relates the *vehicle* τόξων to the

---

[131] *Pace* Christ, *ad loc.*

[132] Apollo's bow: *O.*14.11, *P.*8.18, etc.; Apollo's lyre: *P.*1.1-14, *N.*5.24, *P.*4.176, *Il.*1.603, *Od.*8.448, etc.

tenor 'song', and partly gives it a logical appearance, because ἑκαταβόλων evokes an association with the deity in whose person *tenor* and *vehicle* are united. Moreover, the association with Apollo in line 5 prepares for the reference to Delphi in line 12. The implied presence of Apollo, being the link between both of his attributes, the bow and the lyre, may be compared to Heraclitus, DK 22 B 51: οὐ ξυνιᾶcιν ὅκωc διαφερόμενον ἑωτῶι ὁμολογέει· παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη ὅκωcπερ τόξου καὶ λύρηc. The bow and the lyre are both in themselves examples of contrary forces forming a unity, i.e., a harmony, and therefore also of 'the different being in accordance with itself'. But, apart from that, also the combination of bow and lyre illustrates the doctrine, since both objects differ from eachother while being in accordance to eachother as attributes of the same god.[133] Moreover, if any god may reckon 'harmony' to his province it is Apollo.[134]

61-63. πάνδοκον | ναὸν εὐκλέα διανέμων | Πυθῶνοc ἐν γυάλοιc
The phrase defines that Apollo is addressed in his capacity as the god of Delphi, where the victory was won. It emphasizes the importance of the venue. This adds to Apollo's glory, a rhetorical move that is common enough in prayers. Moreover, it is appropriate to the encomiastic purpose of the ode in quite a direct way, because highlighting the importance of the festival where the victor has won adds also to his glory (*O.*1.1-7 is one of the most elaborate examples).

πάνδοκοc stresses the Panhellenic character of Delphi, as well as its popularity.[135] Cf. Διὸc ... πανδόκωι | ἄλcει, *O.*3.17/8. Religious venues and festivals derive their prestige to a large extent from the number of visitors. Cf. Ἡρακλέηc ... πατρὶ | ἑορτάν τε κτίcηι πλειcτόμβροτον τεθμόν τε μέγιcτον ἀέθλων, *O.*6.68/9. It is a great advantage for an athlete to have won at a popular Panhellenic festival, for his victory has been witnessed by a large number of envoys from all over Greece, which will contribute to the spreading of his glory. Cf. πολυξενωτάτωι παρὰ βωμῶι· τὸ δὲ κλέοc | τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοιc | Πέλοποc, *O.*1.93-5.

For **διανέμω** in the sense of 'having and holding as one's portion,' i.e., 'possessing, governing,' cf. ἔνθεν δ' ὔμμι Λατοίδαc ἔπορεν Λβύαc πεδίον | cὺν θεῶν τιμαῖc ὀφέλλειν, ἄcτυ χρυcοθρόνου | διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράναc | ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοιc, *P.*4.259-62 (with Braswell *ad loc*, pp.

---

[133] Thus F. Lasalle, *Die Philosophie Herakleitos des Dunkeln von Ephesos*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1858), I, pp. 150 ff.; Pfleidere, *Die Philosophie des Heraklit*, pp. 89 ff.; Joel, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, I, p. 316; *pace* G.S. Kirk, *Heraclitus. The Cosmic Fragments* (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 203-21, esp. p. 208, who considers this interpretation to be inconsistent with the first half of the fragment.

[134] Cf. lines 67-9.

[135] Cf. Apollo's order: δέδεχθε δὲ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων, *h.Ap.*538; cf. *ibid.* 479, 483.

358/9). In this sense the verb comes close to the simplex[136] (see my note on *N.*3.82, p. 418). In later authors διανέμω is used almost exclusively in the sense of 'distributing' (Pl.*Lg.*830e, *Tht.*194d, *Ti.*35b, Ar.*Pl.*510, etc.), the middle meaning 'distributing amongst one's own group' (Pl.*Grg.*523a, Arist.*Pol.*1281a15). The noun **γύαλον** means 'hollow,' in Homer of a 'cavity' of the cuirass, where the warrior is vulnerable (*Il.*5.99, 189, 13.507, 587, 15.530, 17.314; see Leaf, *The Iliad*, vol. 1, app. B III, p. 576). It refers to the interior of a mixing bowl (which is obviously hollow) in κρατήρων γυάλοις, E.*IA* 1052. The noun refers to a 'cave' in ὦ κοίλας πέτρας γύαλον | θερμὸν καὶ παγετῶδες, S.*Ph.*1081/2; πέτρινα γύαλα, E.*Hel.*189. Cf. also μεταβειβόμενοι δ' ἐναλλὰξ ἁμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ πατρὶ φίλωι | Διὶ νέμονται (*sc.* the Dioscuri), τὰν δ' ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίας ἐν γυάλοις Θεράπνας, *N.*10.55/6. In the plural the noun may be used metaphorically for 'valley,' cf. ζαθέας Πάρου ἐν γυάλοις, *fr.*140a.63; Νύσης ἐν γυάλοις, *h.Hom.*26.5; referring, like here, to the valley of Delphi: γυάλοις ὕπο Παρνησσοῖο, Hes.*Th.*499 (cf. *h.Ap.*396); παρὰ μεσόμφαλα γύαλα Φοίβου, E.*Ph.*237; E.*Ion* 76, 245. For **ναός** referring to the Apollo temple at Delphi, cf. *P.*3.27, *P.*4.55, *h.Ap.*298; cf. also *Pae.*8.63.

64-65. τὸ μὲν μέγιστον τόθι χαρμάτων | ὤπασας
'You have granted there the greatest of joys,' viz. victory.[137] From τόθι, referring to Delphi, it can be inferred that this ode was performed in Aegina. For ὀπάζω see my note on *N.*3.9 (pp. 257/8). For χάρμα, 'joy,' referring to victory, see my note on *N.*3.66 (p. 375).

65-66. οἴκοι δὲ πρόσθεν ἀρπαλέαν δόσιν | πενταεθλίου ... ἐπάγαγες
'At home, previously, you brought the coveted gift of the Pentathlon.' οἴκοι means 'at home' from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience (cf. *N.*5.45 with my note, p. 175); it conveys that this previous victory was won at a local Aeginetan festival, the Delphinian Games. See next note. This victory is the first of Aristomenes' previous successes to be mentioned. The remainder of the catalogue is given in 78-80 below. It is clear that this local Aeginetan victory has been grouped together with the recent Pythian victory because both festivals are dedicated to Apollo.[138] This allows Pindar to intergrate the obligated reference to this earlier victory into the drift of his argument: the commemoration of earlier victories granted by Apollo has, in the context of the prayer, the traditional persuasive function of *hypomnesis.* On behalf of the victor and his family, Pindar speaks out a prayer of the common type 'god,

---

[136] Thus Ἰακώβ *ad loc.*, p. 304.
[137] Or: the greatest of all the victories on Aristomenes' palmares. Thus Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 578).
[138] See Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 293; Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 464, 467.

if you have favoured them before, favour them now again.'[139] The earlier Aeginetan victory, as well as the recent Pythian one, are presented as earlier favours of Apollo and used as an argument to convince him to grant the favour of κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν βλέπειν, 68.

ἁρπάλεος, associated with ἁρπάζω,[140] means either 'covetous' or 'coveted.' Where it relates to an action similar to 'seizing,' it conveys that this (implied) 'seizing' is done rapaciously and covetously, often with negative connotations. Cf. ἁρπαλέα παλάμη, *AP* 9.576 (Nicarch.), 'an itching palm'; ἦ τοι ὁ πῖνε καὶ ἦcθε ... ἁρπαλέωc, *Od.*6.250; cf. 14.110. When, like here, it qualifies the object of an (implied) action of 'seizing,' it qualifies the object as provoking covetous seizure, so 'coveted.' Cf. κερδέων θ' ἁρπαλέων, *Od.*8.164; πικρὸc καὶ γλυκὺc ἐcτι καὶ ἁρπαλέοc καὶ ἀπηνήc, | ὄφρα τέλειοc ἔῃι, Κύρνε, νέοιcιν ἔρωc, Thgn1353/5; οἷ' ἥβηc ἄνθεα γίνεται ἁρπαλέα, Mimn.*fr.*1.4 W.; ἑτέροιc ἑτέρων ἔρωτεc ἔκνιξαν φρέναc· | τῶν δ' ἕκαcτοc ὀρούει, | τυχὼν κεν ἁρπαλέαν cχέθοι φροντίδα τὰν πὰρ ποδόc, *P.*10.60-2.

For **δόcιc**, cf. τῶν δ' ἐν Ἑλλάδι τερπνῶν | λαχόντεc οὐκ ὀλίγαν δόcιν, *P.*10.19/20; *O.*7.7, *O.*10.56, *P.*1.46, *I.*1.45. For **ἐπάγω** cf. *O.*2.37, *fr.*122.20.

For the synizesis cf. *O.*13.30, *O.*7.7, *O.*3.15, *N.*11.23, *I.*6.48, *I.*1.26 (Boeckh: πένταθλον codd.). Cf. p. 253.

66. cὺν ἑορταῖc ὑμαῖc

This local Aeginetan festival (οἴκοι) must be the Delphinian Games,[141] held in honour of Apollo Delphinios (cf. *N.*5.44/5 with my note, pp. 174/5). The invocation of Apollo in the preceding lines, in his capacity of Delphinian god, makes this veiled reference unequivocal. The plural ὑμαῖc has given rise to some misunderstanding. Only one person is addressed in the context, viz. Apollo; the plural implies that others are included in the speaker's thought. Following the scholiast[142] commentators take this to be Artemis.[143]

---

[139] For this type of prayer, cf., e.g., εἴ ποτ' ἐμᾶν, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, | θυμῶι θέλων ἀρᾶν ἄκουcαc, | νῦν cε, νῦν εὐχαῖc ὑπὸ θεcπεcίαιc | λίccομαι κτλ., *I.*6.42-5. Cf. also Sapph.1 V, *Il.*1.37-42, 451-6, 5.115-20, 10.284-94, 15.372-6, 16.233-2428, *Od.*2.262-6, 4.762-6, 17.240-6, etc. See A.M. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 93), Leiden 1986, 1-4; *GRBS* 30, 1989, 470-2.

[140] Cf. Chantraine, *DELG*, *s.v.* ἄλπνιcτοc. See also Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 578).

[141] Thus also the scholiast: πρὶν λαβεῖν τὰ Πύθια, νενικηκότοc ἐν οἴκωι, τουτέcτιν ἐν Αἰγίνηι ἀγῶνα ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνοc πένταθλον. ἄγεται δὲ ἐν Αἰγίνηι Δελφίνια Ἀπόλλωνι, Σ. 91 (II 215 Dr.).

[142] ταῖc cαῖc, καὶ πλεονάζει τούτωι ὁ Πίνδαροc. τιμᾶται δὲ cφόδρα ἐν Αἰγίνηι Ἀπόλλων καὶ Ἄρτεμιc, Σ. 94 (II 215 Dr.).

[143] Thus Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 331, referring to *P.*4.3), Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 71), Farnell *ad loc.* (II p. 196), Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 211), Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 304), Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 578, referring to *P.*4.3).

Assocating Apollo with Artemis is, of course, not entirely outré (cf. *N*.6.37, *N*.9.4); the problem is, however, that there is no evidence for the Delphinian Games having been held in honour of Artemis as well, and that, apart from the invocation of Apollo, nothing in the context here conjures up Artemis. The others included in the reference of ὑμαῖϲ are the Aeginetans, implied by οἴκοι in the preceding line.

For **ἑορτά** referring to a religieus festival, cf. Ἡρακλέηϲ ... πατρὶ | ἑορτάν τε κτίϲϲηι πλειϲτόμβροτον τεθμόν τε μέγιϲτον ἀέθλων, *O*.6.68/9; *O*.10.57/8; *N*.11.27, *fr*.193.

67-72

Lord, with willing mind do I pray: look according to some harmony at every place where I come. At the side of the sweet-singing procession Right is standing: I pray, Xenarces, for the gods' imperishing regards on your fortunes.

67. ὦναξ, ἑκόντι δ' εὔχομαι νόωι

The renewed apostrophe serves to signal that, after the formal invocation with reference to Apollo's powers and prerogatives (61-3), and to the earlier favours he has granted (the *hypomnesis*, 64-6), the prayer now reaches the point at which the actual request is going to be made.[144] The phrase ἑκόντι νόωι has been taken to qualify εὔχομαι or βλέπειν. The former option is preferable by far.[145] Word order is decisive. Sulzer has argued that in those cases in which an adjective and a noun embrace the verb, they relate to the verb that separates them.[146] More importantly, this interpretation is strongly suggested by the information structure of the sentence: ἑκόντι δ' εὔχομαι νόωι forms a neatly self-contained idea unit; a hearer who preceives the line linearly would naturally take these words together. Not to construe the dative complement with εὔχομαι, the first option, which gives excellent sense, and to save up the qualification for the next phrase, is artificial.[147] In addition, Hubbard may be right in arguing

---

[144] Cf. Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 471. Miller (n. 27) gives the following examples of renewed apostrophe in the request section of a prayer: *Il*.5.117, 10.280, 15.375, 16.523, *Od*.5.450,

[145] For a different opinion see Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 214; Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367; Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 578-80); Robbins, *Companion*, p. 275 n. 76.

[146] Sulzer, *Wortstellung*, pp. 35/6; followed by Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 287; cf. Giannini, *QUCC* 49, 1995, 45.

[147] From the viewpoint of information structure, ἑκόντι τοίνυν πρέπει | νόωι τὸν εὐεργέταν ὑπαντιάϲαι, *P*.5.43/4, cited by Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 473, n. 33, as a counter-example, is incomparable. ἑκόντι πρέπει νόωι is not a sef-contained information unit, so that a hearer has no choice but to save up the dative qualification.

that the strophic boundary reinforces the natural tendency of the audience to contrue ἑκόντι δ' εὔχομαι νόωι together, and in pointing at the "cumbersome accumulation" of qualifications of βλέπειν that would ensue from construing the dative with βλέπειν.[148]

Explicit reference to 'willingness' on the part of the poet is by no means uncommon.

Cf. ἑκόντι δ' ἐγὼ νώτωι μεθέπων δίδυμον ἄχθος | ἄγγελος ἔβαν, *N.*6.57/8; ἐθέλω χαλκάσπιδα Πυθιονίκαν | σὺν βαθυζώνοισιν ἀγγέλλων | Τελεσικράτη Χαρίτεσσι γεγωνεῖν | ὄλβιον ἄνδρα διωξίππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας, *P.*9.1-4; ἀφθόνητος δ' αἶνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαις | οὗτος ἄγκειται. τὰ μὲν ἁμετέρα γλῶσσα ποιμαίνειν ἐθέλει, *O.*11.7-9; ἄνδρα δ' ἐγὼ κεῖνον | αἰνῆσαι μενοινῶν, *P.*1.42/3; Μοίσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἑκὼν | Ὀλιγαιθίδαισίν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος, *O.*13.96/7; ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότωι τεύχων τὸ μὲν ἅρματι τεθρίππωι γέρας, | ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ' ἐθέλω | ἢ Καστορείωι ἢ Ἰολάοι' ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνωι, *I.*1.14-6; Θεανδρίδαισι δ' ἀεξιγυίων ἀέθλων | κάρυξ ἑτοῖμος ἔβαν, *N.*4.73/4; ἔα με· νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεὶς | ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχύς εἰμι καταθέμεν, *N.*7.75/6; cf. also *O.*7.20, *P.*3.77, *fr.*118, *N.*3.12/3 (with my note, pp. 616-9). Bacchylides: ἐθέλει {δὲ} γᾶρυν ἐκ στηθέων χέων | αἰνεῖν Ἱέρωνα, B.5.14-6, *sc.* the servant of Urania (i.e. Bacchylides); πείθομαι εὐμαρέως εὐκλέα κελεύθου γλῶσσαν οὐ[—⏑—] | πέμπειν Ἱέρωνι, B.5.195-7; (χάριν), τὰν εἰκ ἐτύμως ἄρα Κλειὼ πανθαλὴς ἐμαῖς ἐνέσταξ[εν φρασίν], | τερψιεπεῖς νιν ἀ[ο]ιδαὶ παντὶ καρύξοντι λα[ῶ]ι, B.13.228-31; cf. also B.4.9/10. See also Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, p. 287.

These passages have in common that they emphasize the poet's acting on behalf of his commissioner as a task he undertakes willingly: the suggestion is conveyed that he acts spontaneously, on his own account, inspired by the excellence of his subject matter, a suggestion that aims at covering up the mercantile nature of his art. See further introduction, pp. 35-6.

For the phrase, cf. also αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόωι, *O.*2.92. Adverbial qualification of verbs of praying is paralleled by: νῦν εὐχαῖς ὑπὸ θεσπεσίαις | λίσσομαι, *I.*6.44/5; τοῖσιν δὲ Χρύσης μεγάλ' εὔχετο χεῖρας ἀνασχών, *Il.*1.450; 3.275. For the crasis with ὦ, see my note on line 80 below (p. 579).

ANTISTROPHE Δ

68. κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν βλέπειν

A much disputed phrase.[149] The main controversies are (1) whether Pindar or Apollo is the subject of βλέπειν, (2) whether or not κατά ...

[148] Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 287 n. 5, cf. Giannini, *QUCC* 49, 1995, 45.

[149] The most recent studies of detail on this passage are: T.K. Hubbard, 'Pindaric *Harmonia*: *Pythian* 8, 67-69', *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286-92; W.J. Verdenius, 'Pindar, *Pythian* 8, 67-72', *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367/8; J. Taillardat, 'Sur deux passages de la

βλέπειν is a tmesis, (3) the meaning of βλέπειν, (4) the semantics of ἁρμονία, and (5) the meaning and relevance of the phrase as a whole.

(1) The absence of an accusative second person pronoun has led scholars to identify the subject of εὔχομαι, viz. the poet, with the subject of βλέπειν.[150] Cf. Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις ἁδεῖν καλλιπλοκάμωι θ' Ἑλέναι | κλεινὰν Ἀκράγαντα γεραίρων εὔχομαι, *O.*3.1/2; ἀλλ' εὔχεται οὐλομέναν νοῦςον διαντλήσαις ποτὲ | οἶκον ἰδεῖν, *P.*4.293/4; τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς εὔχεται | ἀντιάσαις Ἀΐδαν γῆράς τε δέξασθαι πολιὸν | ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς, *I.*6.14-6; Ζεῦ πάτερ, | εὔχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν, ὑπὲρ πολλῶν τε τιμαλφεῖν λόγοις | νίκαν, ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ' ἄγχιστα Μοισᾶν, *N.*9.53-5. Contrast: Διός τοι νόος μέγας κυβερνᾶι | δαίμον' ἀνδρῶν φίλων. | εὔχομαί νιν Ὀλυμπίαι τοῦτο δόμεν γέρας ἔπι Βάττου γένει, *P.*5.122-4. However, the pre-supposed rule that the subject is continuous whenever an accusative pronoun is lacking is problematized by: Ἑρμᾶ δὲ θυγατρὸς ἀκούσαις Ἰφίων | Ἀγγελίας, ἐνέποι κεν Καλλιμάχωι λιπαρὸν | κόσμον Ὀλυμπίαι, ὅν σφι Ζεὺς γένει | ὤπασεν. ἐσλὰ δ' ἐπ' ἐσλοῖς | ἔργα θέλοι δόμεν, ὀξείας δὲ νόσους ἀπαλάλκοι. | εὔχομαι ἀμφὶ καλῶν μοίραι νέμεσιν διχόβουλον μὴ θέμεν, *O.*8.81-6, where Zeus must be the subject of θέμεν;[151] and: πλεῖστα νικάσαντά σε καὶ τελεταῖς | ὡρίαις ἐν Παλλάδος εἶδον ἄφωνοί θ' ὡς ἕκασται φίλτατον | παρθενικαὶ πόσιν ἢ | υἱὸν εὔχοντ', ὦ Τελεσίκρατες, ἔμμεν, *P.*9.97-100. Cf. also θεοῖς⟨ιν⟩ δ' ἀνίσχοντες χέρας ἀθανάτοις | εὔχοντο παύσασθαι δυᾶν, B.15.45/6; πρῶτα μὲν εὐχώμεσθα Διὶ Κρονίδηι βασιλῆϊ | θεσμοῖς τοῖσδε τύχην ἀγαθὴν καὶ κῦδος ὀπάσσαι, Sol.31 W., etc.

A closer look at these passages suggests that the audience, in their identification of the subject of the infinitive, are led by other factors than presence or absence of a disambiguating pronoun. In *O.*3.1/2, *P.*4.293/4, and *I.*6.14-6, there is simply no other canditate available for the subject of the infinitive than the subject of the finite verb. In

---

VIIIe Pythique (v. 67-69 et 77-78)', *REG* 99, 1986, 225-38; A.M. Miller, 'Apolline Ethics and Olympian Victory in Pindar's Eighth *Pythian* 67-78', *GRBS* 30, 1989, 461-84; P. Giannini, 'Note esegetiche alle *Pitiche* 6 e 8 di Pindaro', *QUCC* 49, 1995, 39-53 (slightly modified in his 1995 commentary *ad loc.* in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, pp. 578-80).

[150] "One principle of syntax should be borne in mind: the subject of βλέπειν should be Pindar, not Apollo, if εὔχομαι βλέπειν stands alone; for the infinitive should have the same subject as the principal verb," Farnell *ad loc.* (II, p. 196); "When no subject is expressed, it is inherently much more likely that the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the main verb," Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286/7. Thus also Mezger (p. 406), Christ (p. 199), Fraccaroli (p. 138 n. 2), Gildersleeve (p. 331), Fennell (p. 242), Sandys (p. 265), Finley (*Pindar and Aeschylus*, p. 172), Norwood (*Pindar*, p. 82), Bowra (*Pindar*, p. 400), Kirkwood (p. 211).

[151] Thus Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, pp. 578/9).

*P.*9.97-100, the vocative address is used in order to disambiguate. A different situation arises if a deity has been invoked in the context. In a prayer, deities are more often than not invoked because the speaker wants them to do something. So, in the case of εὔχομαι following a reference to a deity, one would expect the depending infinitive to specify the action that the deity is asked to undertake, as in *O.*8.81-6,[152] B.15.45/6, Sol.31 W., and *P.*5.122-4. *N.*9.53-5 is the exception, but there any risk of misunderstanding is excluded since the depending infinitives unequivocally describe actions which the poet prays successfully to undertake; the meaning of the depending infinitive clauses makes a disambiguating first person pronoun unnecessary.

That discontinuity of the subject is the rule rather than the exception in contexts of prayers to gods is confirmed by Pindar's usage of λίϲϲομαι. It may be followed by an imperative, specifying the action the deity is entreated to undertake (*O.*12.1, *P.*1.71, *N.*3.1). In εἴ ποτ' ἐμᾶν, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, | θυμῶι θέλων ἀρᾶν ἄκουϲαϲ, | νῦν ϲε, νῦν εὐχαῖϲ ὑπὸ θεϲπεϲίαιϲ | λίϲϲομαι παῖδα θραϲὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίαϲ | ἀνδρὶ τῶιδε ξεῖνον ἁμὸν μοιρίδιον τελέϲαι, *I.*6.42-6, the depending infinitive clause performs this fuction, as in: πρὸϲ Ὀλυμπίου Διόϲ ϲε, χρυϲέα κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ, | λίϲϲομαι Χαρίτεϲϲίν τε καὶ ϲὺν Ἀφροδίται, | ἐν ζαθέωι με δέξαι χρόνωι | ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν, *Pae.*6.1-6,[153] where, according to the syntactical rule which in our passage here leads some scholars to take the subject to be continuous, με would have to be interpreted as the subject of δέξαι, instead of its object.

The fact that εὔχομαι here follows an invocation of Apollo strongly pleads in favour of taking him to be the subject of the depending infinitive clause.[154] Lines 61-9 have the traditional structure of a prayer: invocation (61), reference to the god's powers (61-3), to earlier favours he has granted (64-6), renewed apostrophe (ὦναξ, 67). This gives rise to the expectancy that a request is to follow. That κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν βλέπειν formulates the action that Apollo is entreated to undertake, is in keeping with the expectancies raised on

---

[152] Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 287 n. 3, disqualifies *O.*8.86 as a parallel to *h.l.*, on the ground that there, unlike *h.l.*, "the verses both before and after contain third-person optatives of which the god is the subject." But Apollo is just as present in the preceding discourse here as is Zeus in *O.*8.81-6. The vocative address ὦναξ directly preceding the prayer prepares for a request to Apollo just as the optatives do in the other passage (cf. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 46, 1983, 367; Giannini, *QUCC* 49, 1995, 48).

[153] Radt *ad loc.* takes δέξαι to be an imperative.

[154] Those taking Apollo to be the subject of βλέπειν include Heyne (I, pp. 280/1), Boeckh (II, 2, p. 317), Dissen (II, p. 312), Wilmowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 442), Schroeder (p. 74), Puech (II, p. 123), Burton (*Pythian Odes*, p. 186), Thummer (*Religiosität*, p. 24 n. 3), Lefkowitz (*CJ* 72, 1977, 214), Verdenius (*Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367/8), Taillardat (*REG* 99, 1986, 228/9 with n. 11), Ἰακώβ (*ad loc.*, p. 304), Giannini (*QUCC* 49, 1995, 48).

the part of the audience; therefore, a disambiguating accusative second person pronoun is unnecessary.[155]

(2) The suggestion that κατά ... βλέπειν is a tmesis[156] must be rejected. Tmesis is typically found in situations where the prefix cannot be construed as a preposition, or where the simplex does not exist, does not make sense, or is very much less familiar to the hearer than the compound verb. Here we have exactly the opposite. Nothing prevents a listening audience of this line to take κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν together. The verb καταβλέπειν is rare and late (Call.*Del.*303, Lxx.*Ge.*18.16, Plut.*Arat.*32, *Mor.*469b, 680d, *BGU* 15 ii 5 [ii AD]).

(3) A god's looking at humans is often regarded as a sign of his favour or help:[157] cf. ἐν Κρίcαι δ' εὐρυcθενὴc εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν, *I.*2.18; ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάριc ζωθάλμιοc ἁδυμελεῖ | θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοιcί τ' ἐν ἔντεcιν αὐλῶν, *O.*7.11/2; τὶν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίαc ἕπεται. | λαγέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρκεται, | εἴ τιν' ἀνθρώπων, ὁ μέγαc πότμοc, *P.*3.84-6; ἵλεῳ νιν ὁ Δα[λ]ογενὴc υἱὸc βαθυζώνο[ιο] Λατοῦc | δέκτ[ο] βλεφά[ρω]ι, B.11.15-7. In Διόθεν τέ με cὺν Ἀγλαΐαι | ἴδετε πορευθέντ' ἀοιδᾶν δεύτερον | ἐπὶ τὸν κιccοδόταν θεόν, *fr.*75.7-9, the poet prays for the gods to look at him; cf. also ⟨ὦ⟩ πότνι' Ἀγλαΐα | φιληcίμολπέ τ' Εὐφροcύνα, θεῶν κρατίcτου | παῖδεc, ἐπακοοῖτε νῦν, Θαλία τε | ἐραcίμολπε, ἰδοῖcα τόνδε κῶμον ἐπ' εὐμενεῖ τύχαι | κοῦφα βιβῶντα, *O.*14.13-7, where the request for the Graces' assistance is paralleled by the first strophe.

So the poet's prayer for Apollo to 'look' can be understood as a request for his favour. The phrase θεῶν ὄπιν in 71 below resumes the idea of divine favours formulated in visual terms. However, the combination with κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν is far from unproblematic. Syntactically the phrase is unparalleled. The adverbial phrase κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν could perhaps be regarded as a syntactical equivalent of an adverb,[158] so as to parallel passages like φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλοc ἀνὴρ βλέπων, *N.*4.39 (cf. also Alcm.1.75 P., Anacr.72.1 P., A.*Sept.*498, Ar.*Ran.*562, X.*Mem.*3.10.4, *Smp.*4.58, etc.). However this may be, the

---

[155] For "the prayer as a rhetorical structure is in essence an argument that builds from propitiation of the divinity, through the establishment of a prior claim upon him, to the lodging of a request which that claim justifies," cf. Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 471/2.

[156] Thus Wilamowitz, *Reden aus der Kriegszeit*, Berlin 1915, *VII: Die Harmonie der Sphären*, p. 136; *Pindaros*, pp. 442/3; A. Corlu, *Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l'idée de prière*, Paris 1966, pp. 100, 101, 337; Gildersleeve, p. 331; Mezger, p. 406, Sandys, p. 265, Schroeder, p. 73, Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 185; Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 400; Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 228/9.

[157] Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367.

[158] Thus Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367/8, quoting phrases like καθ' ἡcυχίαν, κατὰ κράτοc, κατὰ φύcιν. Thus also Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (pp. 304/5).

qualification seems to specify the way in which Apollo is requested to look, so the desired attitude on his part. If the request for his 'looking' is interpreted as a request for his favour, the desired attitude naturally merges with the object of the request. 'Apollo, favour us according to an attitude of a certain harmony' implies that 'a certain harmony' is the desired result of the god's favouring. Thus κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν specifies what the favour asked for consists in; the following line, ἀμφ' ἕκαστον, ὅσα νέομαι, specifies what it pertains to.[159]

(4) What does it mean that the poet prays for Apollo 'to look according to, i.e., to favour with respect to a certain ἁρμονία'? **ἁρμονία** is a musical *terminus technicus*, denoting aesthetically pleasing melodic progression of high and low notes, i.e., 'harmony' in our sense of the word, with the difference that in Greek this is a diachronic, not a synchronic concept. This is the sense in the two other Pindaric occurrences of the noun: ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ, | Λυδίαι cὺν ἁρμονίαι μέλος, *N.*4.44/5; ἀοιδὰν κ[αὶ ἁ]ρμονίαν αὐλ[οῖc ἐ]πεφράc[ατο, *fr.*140b.2.

Cf. also ἐκ διαφερομένων πρότερον τοῦ ὀξέος καὶ βαρέος, ἔπειτα ὕcτερον ὁμολογηcάντων γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῆc μουcικῆc τέχνηc (*sc.* ἁρμονία). οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐκ διαφερομένων γε ἔτι τοῦ ὀξέος καὶ βαρέος ἁρμονία ἂν εἴη· ἡ γὰρ ἁρμονία cυμφωνία ἐcτίν, cυμφωνία δὲ ὁμολογία τιc ... ὥcπερ γε καὶ ὁ ῥυθμὸc ἐκ τοῦ ταχέος καὶ βραδέος, ἐκ διενηνεγμένων πρότερον, ὕcτερον δὲ ὁμολογηcάντων γέγονε, Pl.*Smp.*187a-c; τῆι δὲ (*sc.* τάξει) αὖ τῆc φωνῆc, τοῦ τε ὀξέος ἅμα καὶ βαρέος cυγκεραννυμένων, ἁρμονία ὄνομα προcαγορεύοιτο, Pl.*Lg.*665a; [Arist.] *Pr.*19.27. See also P.B. Meyer, *ΑΡΜΟΝΙΑ: Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes von Homer bis Aristoteles*, Zürich 1932, 32/3. For a convenient overview of non-musical usages of the noun see Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 468 n. 17.

It makes sense that Pindar prays for Apollo to bestow 'harmony,' in a musical sense, upon everything the poet undertakes. Music is part of the performance of a victory ode. Heavenly help in this area would certainly be appreciated. Apollo, the god of music and the lyre (cf. the proem of *P.*1, *N.*5.23-5, etc.), is the right god to address such a request to.

(5) The indefinite **τιν'**,[160] however, seems to signal that, in addition,

---

[159] It will be clear that I no longer subscribe to my earlier view that βλέπειν is corrupt (*Hermes* 123, 1995, 164).

[160] De Pauw (p. 211) suggested to interpret the mss. reading as τὶν, which could be a dative or an accusative. As an accusative, it must depend on κατά, βλέπειν gouverning ἁρμονίαν ('to observe harmony in accordance with you', thus Fraccaroli, p. 138 n. 2; Norwood, p. 237 n. 42). But τίν in Pindar is always a dative (cf. Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 185). Farnell (II, p. 197) takes it to be a dative complement to ἁρμονίαν, as some sort of *nomen verbale*: 'in harmony with thee, Apollo.' Thus also Giannini, *QUCC* 49, 1995, 45-53; cf. his interpretation of ἁρμονία in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 579: "qui, in senso traslato, ['accordo'] tra il dio ed il canto del poeta (come in Pl.*Lach.*188d tra le parole e le azioni)." This is artificial.

ἁρμονία is used metaphorically.[161] For indefinite τιϲ supporting a metaphor, cf. *P.*11.39, *P.*2.90 (with Most, *AJPh* 108, 1987, 577). It has been argued that the metaphorical interpretation suggested is propriety in encomastic duties, in particular 'thematic harmony,' i.e., propriety in thematic transitions.[162] However, appropriate composition is not at issue in this passage. The fact that Dika (who occurred in the first line in an explicitly political context) immediately follows gives rise to a different interpretation. As it has been argued in the interpretation (pp. 431-4) δίκα, in the eyes of the elite, represents this desired state of affairs, i.e., the division of power and property that prevailed before 457 B.C. Thus interpreted, the statement in 70/1 means that 'at this moment, during the feast for Aristomenes, there is a situation of δίκα in Aegina, a situation in which the rivalling factions are temporarily reconciled for the sake of hte victory celebrations. See further *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-65 (esp. pp. 163/4), and my interpretation, pp. 443/4. This makes it likely that 'certain harmony' refers to political concord on Aegina. See further interpretation, pp. 442/3.

69. ἀμφ' ἕκαϲτον, ὅϲα νέομαι

νέομαι is usually taken metaphorically, referring to the poet's 'journey' past the themes of his ode: "The things which Pindar *comes to* may include the successive themes treated in the course of the poem."[163] The image of the 'paths of song' is found frequently in Pindar.[164] However, there is no need to narrow down the reference

---

Moreover, the problem with these interpretations is that they still require a metaphorical interpretation of ἁρμονία while the signal for such a metaphorical interpretation, the indefinite τιϲ, has been disposed of. Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 242) apparently reads τιν' as a masculine pronoun: 'I pray that I may be regarding due proportion according to anyone's merits.' See also Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 474 n. 36, 477 n. 43.

161 Thus Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 289. Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 579) says that the indefinite τιν' signals reverence for the god: "l'indeterminatezza da esso evidenziata è ispirata forse (come in A.*Ag.*947 τιϲ ... φθόνοϲ) a riverenza verso la divinità, di cui non si vuole coinvolgere per intero la potenza, positiva o negativa, di cui è capace." Cf. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367/8; Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 305).

162 Thus Σ. 95a, Fennel *ad loc.* (p. 242), Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 331), Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 74), Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, p. 288; Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 186; Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286-92.; Carne-Ross, *Pindar*, p. 180; Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 230/1. Alternatively, Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 475/6, argues in favour of interpreting ἁρμονία as 'fittingness', moderation, i.e., as implying the warning that Aristomes must not let the success go to his head.

163 Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 290. Thus also Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 305); Giannini, *QUCC* 49, 1995, 46/7, and in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 579.

164 Examples include *P.*4.247, *O.*6.23, *P.*11.38/9, *I.*4.1, *O.*1.110, *N.*6.54, *O.*8.54, *N.*5.50, *N.*3.26-8. See Becker, *Bild des Weges*, pp. 68-85; Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 186.

of νέομαι exclusively to thematic progression. Unlike with the other occurrences of the path of song image, this is not a transitional passage. Thematic procedures are not at issue here.

Pindar prays for Apollo to bestow the favour of effecting 'a certain harmony' at every place, wherever he comes (for **ἀμφί** with an accusative in a local sense, 'at, in,' cf. θαυμαστὸς ἐὼν φάνη Ζηνὸς ἀμφὶ πανάγυριν Λυκαίου, *O.*9.96; Κυράναι γλυκὺν ἀμφὶ κᾶπον Ἀφροδίτας ἀειδόμενον, *P.*5.24; *P.*10.56, *O.*1.17, *I.*2.40, *fr.*187; cf. also ἀμφὶ ἑ παπτῆνας, *Il.*4.497, 15.574). This gives excellent sense both with the literal and with the metaphorical interpretation of ἁρμονία: wherever the poet arrives in his professional capacity, i.e., wherever he stages a performance, he hopes that Apollo will help him to bring about musical harmony, i.e., aesthetically pleasing song; moreover, he hopes that his songs will have a fraternizing effect upon the communities that perform them. Obviously, this applies pre-eminently to the present song and to the current situation in Aegina, in particular to the victor and his family, as the following lines specify (70-2). The prayer is first given in a veiled and generalized way, then made explicit and specific—a procedure that is by no means uncommon for Pindar (cf. 39-42 above, with my notes, p. 527, cf. 44-7, etc.).

For **ἕκαστον, ὅσα** (ἀμφ' ἕκαστον being felt as a plural notion) cf. ὀρθὰν ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν, | τά ποτ' ἐν οὔρεσί φαντι μεγαλοσθενεῖ | Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανιζομένωι | Πηλεΐδαι παραινεῖν, *P.*6.19-23, where τά picks up ἐφημοσύναν as a plural notion: 'the things he recommended.' See also LSJ *s.v.*

70-71. κώμωι μὲν ἁδυμελεῖ | Δίκα παρέστακε

'At the side of the sweet-singing procession Dika is standing.' The present reference of the perfect makes clear that **κῶμος** is used metaphorically, referring to the current choral performance of the present ode[165] (contrast line 20 above where the past reference of ἔδεκτο makes clear that κῶμος is used in the literal sense, referring to the improptu revel at the site of the victory; see my note, pp. 500-2).

As Malcolm Heath has shown in his 'Receiving the Κῶμος: The Context and Performance of the Epinician', *AJPh* 109, 1988, 180-195, the κῶμος evokes associations with the revelry after a symposium. In Pindar, as in the works of other epinician poets for that matter, references are being made to epinician κῶμοι. In some passages it is clear that κῶμος refers to impromptu celebrations on the scene of the victory (references in my note on line 20 above, p. 500). However, Pindar refers on several occasions to his *own* ode as 'this κῶμος.'

[165] Thus Σ.99b, and most commentators; most recently A. Burnett, *CP* 84, 1989, 292. For a different opinion see Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 478/9.

Cf. ἀλλ', ὦ Κρόνου παῖ, ... Ὀλυμπιονίκαν | δέξαι Χαρίτων θ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον, *O*.4.8-11; ἀλλ', ὦ Πίσας εὔδενδρον ἐπ' Ἀλφεῷι ἄλσος, | τόνδε κῶμον καὶ στεφαναφορίαν δέξαι, *O*.8.9/10; μάκαρ δὲ καὶ νῦν, κλεεννᾶς ὅτι | εὖχος ἤδη παρὰ Πυθιάδος ἵπποις ἑλὼν | δέδεξαι τόνδε κῶμον ἀνέρων, | Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα, *P*.5.20-3; ὦ πότνι' Ἀγλαΐα | φιλησίμολπέ τ' Εὐφροσύνα, θεῶν κρατίστου | παῖδες, ἐπακοοῖτε νῦν, Θαλία τε | ἐρασίμολπε, ἰδοῖσα τόνδε κῶμον ἐπ' εὐμενεῖ τύχαι | κοῦφα βιβῶντα, *O*.14.13-7.

In other passages, without the deictic motif, too, it is clear that Pindar refers to his own odes: Φυλακίδαι γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῖσα, ταμίας | Πυθέαι τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε, *I*.6.57/8; τῶι (*sc.* for Hieron) διδύμας χάριτας | εἰ κατέβαν ὑγίειαν ἄγων χρυσέαν | κῶμόν τ' ἀέθλων Πυθίων αἴγλαν στεφάνοις, | τοὺς ἀριστεύων Φερένικος ἕλεν Κίρραι ποτέ, *P*.3.72-4; μελιγαρύων τέκτονες | κώμων νεανίαι, *N*.3.4/5 (see my note *ad loc*, pp. 248/9).

This usage should surprise us. Most of us can hardly imagine Pindar's odes in fact to have been performed by an unruly, inebriated mob. Moreover, in the proem of *O*.9 (τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος | φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίαι, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδώς, | ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἁγεμονεῦσαι | κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστωι σὺν ἑταίροις, 1-4), "'sufficed' (ἄρκεσε) and the strong adversative which introduces Pindar's song (ἀλλὰ νῦν) imply a marked qualitative difference" between the simple and familiar Archilochus song, suitable for impromptu κωμάζειν, and Pindar's own epinician of greater sophistication (Heath, p. 188). This has led Heath (followed by Lefkowitz and others, see my notes on the proem of *N*.3, pp. 242, 249, 267/8) to suggest a sharp distinction between κῶμοι and formal epinician songs; so, to suggest that Pindar in fact does *not* refer to his own odes as κῶμοι. Heath envisages a situation in which "the victor and his friends made their way to the venue in a festive procession, a κῶμος. ... Songs were sung *en route*, on arrival, and at the symposium after the feast. ... Most of the commissioned odes that we possess were probably written to be performed solo[166] on arrival" (p. 193). "In the passages cited earlier in which the poet refers to 'this κῶμος' he is speaking on its behalf and requests a favourable reception" (pp. 188/9).

Heath's hypothesis has the advantage of bringing Pindar's usage of κῶμος in line with the traditions of komastic literature. However, its drawback is that it is uneconomical, in that it postulates an other performance, that of the κῶμος, in addition to the performance of Pindar's odes. For some passages the evidence needs be stretched quite a bit in order to avoid the conclusion that Pindar, with κῶμος,

166 For the implications of Heath's hypothesis for the performance of Pindar's odes (the 'solo hypothesis'), see my notes on the proem of *N*.3, pp. 242, 249, 267/8.

refers to the choral performances of his own odes.[167] Moreover, Heath fails fully to appreciate the fictional dimension of the way Pindar tends to present himself as a composer and his chorus as performers. Take, e.g., the proem of *N.*9: κωμάcομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνοc Cικυωνόθε, Μοῖcα, | τὰν νεοκτίcταν ἐc Αἴτναν, ἔνθ' ἀναπεπταμέναι ξείνων νενίκανται θύραι, | ὄλβιον ἐc Χρομίου δῶμ'. ἀλλ' ἐπέων γλυκὺν ὕμνον πράccετε, *N.*9.1-3. Pindar proposes to the Muses to set out in a κῶμοc from Sicyon to the victor's home town Aetna, and asks them to provide a 'sweet hymn' for that purpose. The 'sweet hymn' is the hymn the audience is listening to on the very moment of the request; and this, Pindar's, hymn is presented as the song to be sung by the komasts *en route.* Obviously this presentation is fictional. The progress envisaged from Sicyon to Aetna is not possible for a real κῶμοc.[168] The future κωμάcομεν and the imperative πράccετε project the performance of this ode into the future, whereas it has in fact begun already.[169] This fictional presentation give an air of spontaneity to the proem. It creates the illusion of an impromptu performance. The image of a κῶμοc ties in with this presentation. Pindar presents his well rehearsed choral performance as spontaneous κωμάζειν, taking the audience in fancy back vividly to the place of victory, which has the effect of recapturing the excitement of celebration immediately after the victory.[170]

This fiction is resumed at the very end of the ode: ἡcυχία δὲ φιλεῖ μὲν cυμπόcιον· νεοθαλὴc δ' αὔξεται | μαλθακᾶι νικαφορία cὺν ἀοιδᾶι· θαρcαλέα δὲ παρὰ κρατῆρα φωνὰ γίνεται. | ἐγκρινάτω τίc νιν, γλυκὺν κώμου προφάταν, | ἀργυρέαιcι δὲ νωμάτω φιάλαιcι βιατὰν | ἀμπέλου παῖδ', ἅc ποθ' ἵπποι κτηcάμεναι Χρομίωι πέμψαν θεμιπλέκτοιc ἁμᾶ | Λατοΐδα cτεφάνοιc ἐκ τᾶc ἱερᾶc Cικυῶνοc. Ζεῦ πάτερ, | εὔχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆcαι cὺν Χαρίτεccιν, ὑπὲρ πολλῶν τε τιμαλφεῖν λόγοιc | νίκαν, ἀκοντίζων cκοποῖ' ἄγχιcτα Μοιcᾶν, 48-55. The κῶμοc has now reached its goal and the celebration may begin.[171]

The fictional presentation encompassing a κῶμοc can be compared to the proem of *I.*8: Κλεάνδρωι τιc ἁλικίαι τε λύτρον εὔδοξον, ὦ νέοι, καμάτων | πατρὸc ἀγλαὸν Τελεcάρχου παρὰ πρόθυρον | ἰὼν ἀνεγειρέτω | κῶμον, Ἰcθμιάδοc τε νίκαc ἄποινα, καὶ Νεμέαι | ἀέθλων ὅτι κράτοc ἐξεῦρε· τῶ καὶ ἐγώ, καίπερ

---

[167] See Carey, *AJP* 110, 1989, 545-565; *CPh* 86, 1991, 192-200. See also my notes on the proem of *N.*3.

[168] Thus Heath, p. 190, who concludes: "I think we must understand an imaginary κῶμοc of Muses." Cf. Bundy, I p. 22.

[169] For *First Person Futures* creating the illusion that the ode has not started yet, see my notes on the proem of *N.*3, and my *First Person Futures,* pp. 33-43.

[170] Carey, 'Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode', *Tria Lustra.*

[171] See Farnell, II, p. 310; Carey, 'Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode', *Tria Lustra.*

ἀχνύμενος | θυμόν, αἰτέομαι χρυσέαν καλέσαι | Μοῖσαν, *I.*8.1-6. In lines 1-5 Pindar incites the chorus (νέοι) to 'start a κῶμος' at the threshold of the victor's house, as a compensation for his hardships and a reward for his victory. By means of τῶ καὶ ἐγώ in 5, Pindar associates own role with the κῶμοι of his chorus. Again, we find the fictitious projection of the performance into the future. The fiction effected here is the idea that the chorus sets out in a κῶμος and that Pindar will join in (cf. for a similar fiction *N.*3.10-2). Again, the presentation of his chorus as if it were a κῶμος aims at creating the illusion of a spontaneous, impromptu performance.

Taking into account the fictional dimension of Pindar's self-presentation allows one to understand why the poet uses the noun κῶμος in order to refer to the choral performance of his own odes, without the need of extrapolating any additional performances. Heath's reconstruction of the nature of the κῶμος and of the traditions of komastic literature is valuable in that it brings to light the fiction of spontaneity that Pindar aims at, a fiction that is present on several level's of his compositions. Thus, in other words, Pindar's usage of the noun κῶμος, when referring to his own odes, can be called metaphorical, to the extent that the denotation 'unruly festive mob' is excluded in favour of the connotations of a 'party of celebrating men, singing and dancing, adorned with garlands.' The *target* of this metaphor is to conjure up the spontaneity of the unregualted outburstings of joy at the scene of the victory.

Pindar's usage of κῶμος is to that extent comparable to his use of καλλίνικος qualifying his own odes, as in εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἁλίωι | σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων | θαμά κε, τῶιδε μέλει κλιθείς, | ὕμνον κελάδησε καλλίνικον, *N.*4.13-6, and probably also in ἔχοντα Πυθωνόθεν | τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν | μέλος χαρίεν, *P.*5.105-7. See also *N.*3.18 with my note *ad loc.* (pp. 279-81). The traditional extempore celebration τήνελλα καλλίνικε, referred to by τὸ καλλίνικον, symbolizes the joy of victory in general. Τὸ καλλίνικον takes us back vividly to the scene of the victory, conjuring up spontaneity also for the present celebration. Similarly, Pindar uses ὄαρος for referring to his odes sung by the boys' chorus, as in ἄρχε δ', οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ, | δόκιμον ὕμνον· ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὀάροις | λύραι τε κοινώσομαι, *N.*3.10-2. The denotation 'chat', i.e. conversation of an unofficial character, is excluded in favour of the connotation 'friendly and becoming utterance.'[172] Similarly:

---

[172] Heath's pressing question addressed to those defending the traditional viewpoint that Pindar's victory odes were performed by choruses, "why, if formal, prepared dance was a regular and integral part of epinician performance, did Pindar not take more notice of it than he does?" (pp. 186/7), can be answered along these same lines. On several levels does Pindar show a tendency to conceal the professional nature of his odes, exerting himself to create an air of spontaneity, which is of course fictional, since the performance in fact was precedeed by a careful process of composition and without doubt lengthy rehearsal. So Pindar does not take more

τὸν δὲ ... | ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾶι φάτις, | οὐδὲ μιν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφιαι κοινωνίαν[173] | μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροιcι δέκονται, *P.*1.95-8, of (non-existent) celebrations of Phalaris' (non-existent) virtues by boys in an informal dining-hall (cf. ὑπωρόφιαι) setting (Pindar may have had in mind something like the scolia in praise of Harmodius and Aristogeiton).

The presence[174] of **Δίκα** at Aristomenes' victory-procession is generally taken to refer to the 'encomiastic propriety' heeded by the poet, in the sense of 'appropriate composition',[175] or as implying the idea that the victor fully deserves the praise he is getting.[176] But there is no passage in Pindar where δίκα refers to 'encomiastic propriety', the opposite of encomiastic excess, as it has been suggested, among other, by Bundy.[177] Moreover, 'appropriate composition' is not at issue in this passage. Note also that Pindar does not say that Dika is present in his song, but that she is standing by the κῶμοc, a statement that focusses less on the poet's own specific role than on the choral performance that visualizes the collective Aeginetan celebration of this victory.

In ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόροc | οὐ δίκαι cυναντόμενοc, ἀλλὰ μαργῶν ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, | τὸ λαλαγῆcαι θέλον κρυφὸν τιθέμεν ἐcλῶν καλοῖc ἔργοιc, *O.*2.95-8, the point is not that "mere length does not ensure a just encomion" (Bundy, II, 61, n. 69), but rather that the κόροc referred to results in deserved fame being obscured; in other words, the κόροc simply violates the principle that accomplishments must be praised.[178] εὐώνυμον ἐc δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέcει, *N.*7.48, does mean that "a just praise will require but few words" (Bundy, *ibid.*), but that it requires but few words is said by τρία ἔπεα διαρκέcει;[179] εὐώνυμον ἐc δίκαν means 'as regards their good name that they fully deserve.'[180] For *N.*3.29 see my note *ad loc.* (pp. 630-8).

That Aristomenes fully deserves this collective Aeginetan celebration is certainly an implication of these lines. But the fact that Dika occurred in the first line of this ode, personified like here, in an explic-

---

notice of formal, prepared elements of his composition, because he prefers not to. He prefers to conjure up the primary, spontaneous ouburstings of joy directly after the victory. For Pindar's tendency towards spontaneity see also my introduction, pp. 53/4.

173 For the orthography of this noun see my note on *N.*3.12. κοινώcομαι.

174 For the verb παρέcτακε referring to divine presence and protection cf. *O.*3.4, *O.*10.52.

175 Thus Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, I p. 61 n. 69; Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286-292.

176 Thus Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367/8.

177 Bundy, II, 61 n. 69. Cf. also Hubbard, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 291; Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, p. 43, 68.

178 Κόροc in this passage does not refer to the inselective use of encomiastic material — as opposed to Pindar's own method —, but to the state of mind of those who are annoyed by another man's success. See my note on line 32 above (pp. 510/1).

179 For τρία cf. D.19.209, Ar.*Nub.*1402.

180 Thus also Slater *s.v.* εὐώνυμον (p. 214). Δίκα does not mean 'veritatem' (cf. Carey *ad loc.*, quoting Heyne).

itly political context, suggests that Dika's presence at the victory celebrations derives its relevance from contemporary political circumstances. See further interpretation, pp. 443/4.

71-72. θεῶν δ' ὄπιν | ἄφθιτον αἰτέω, Ξέναρκες, ὑμετέραις τύχαις 'I pray, Xenarces, for the gods' imperishing regards on your fortunes.' The τύχαι of Xenarces and his family consist in Aristomenes' recent victory, naturally; but the context focusses upon the symbolic poignancy of the victory celebrations: as lines 70/1 make clear, their τύχαι consist in the temporary restoration of the situation of δίκα in Aegina. The statement that the current festivities symbolize a momentary restoration of δίκα as the elite perceives it, is followed by a prayer that this restoration of δίκα will turn out to be definitive. Xenarces is the victor's father (cf. line 19 above). That he, not the victor himself, is addressed in this particular context, is certainly more than just a coincidence. As a member of the Meidylid clan he would have been included among those who had suffered worst from the pro-Athenian domination installed in Aegina in 457 B.C.

ἄφθιτον is the reading of the mss. The scholiast paraphrases ἀνεπίφθονον (99b, II 216 Dr.), which is evidence for an ancient *varia lectio* ἄφθονον. There are compelling arguments in favour of keeping the mss. reading.[181] ἄφθιτον suits the status of this sentence in the light of what has preceded as it is marked by the particles: μέν in line 70 is balanced by δ' in 71. This indicates that the two clauses, κώμῳ μὲν ἀδυμελεῖ | Δίκα παρέςτακε (70/1) and θεῶν δ' ὄπιν | ἄφθιτον αἰτέω, Ξέναρκες, ὑμετέραις τύχαις (71/2), are members of one complex, balancing one another and to that extent forming counterparts.[182] If ἄφθιτον is kept, this can easily be understood. Dika, 'the way it should be' in the eyes of the aristocracy naturally is crucial to the τύχαι of Xenarces and his family. Thus the observation that 'at this moment, during the feast for Aristomenes, there is a situation of δίκα in Aegina' is followed by the prayer that this may remain so in

---

[181] The reading ἄφθιτον is kept by Bergk, Fennell, Gildersleeve, Farnell, Puech, Turyn; Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, p. 368, n. 1; Gentili (*Pitiche*, p. 226; cf. Giannini's note *ad loc.*, p. 580).

[182] See Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 12. Cf. Farnell *ad loc.* (II p. 197): "μέν and δέ come dangerously close to a suggestion that Justice was present with them on this occasion but might not be in the future. He could not of course say this. It may be he has some thought in his mind which he waives away—'I cannot guarantee the future, but at all events may God's favour be ungrudging to you!'" Farnell is right in connecting 71/2 closely with the preceding assertion, and in concluding that the request in 71/2 entails a continuation of the situation that δίκα is present. Δίκα, however, does not mean 'Justice,' but 'The Way It Should Be' in the eyes of the traditional elite.

the future. ἄφθονον would have no function but to dissociate continuation of the present situation from envy of the gods, a point that does not seem very relevant in this particular context,—not to say out of place, since continuation of τύχαι that are associated with δίκα can hardly be imagined to be liable to the gods' envy. Divine interference in human affairs is recurrently described in the following lines, but nowhere associated with divine envy. ἄφθιτον, on the other hand, in focusing upon continuation of the prevailing situation, underscores the point at issue precisely: the festivities for Aristomenes are a momentary restoration of δίκα as aristocracy perceives it; the prayer is for *definitive* restoration of the traditional set-up.

The main reason for preferring ἄφθονον is the fact that the phrase θεῶν ὄπιν is in other authors frequently used in a negative sense, of divine punishment (see below); an unequivocally positive qualification of the phrase, ruling out the negative connotations, seems at first sight welcome. However, on closer conseration, the context makes it perfectly clear that θεῶν ὄπιν refers to the positive 'regard' of the gods, i.e., their favour, also if the phrase went unqualified. Moreover, if Pindar's audience associated ὄπιν with vision, they would feel that θεῶν ὄπιν picks up βλέπειν in 68, which refers to Apollo's favouring.[183] Miller (*GRBS* 30, 1989, 465 n. 7) objects to ἄφθιτον that "Pindar elsewhere restricts his use of that adjective to entities that are in literal fact immune to mortal transience and decay: deities (*P.*4.33, 291, *I.*8.41), divinized heroes (*O.*1.63, 2.29), the Golden Fleece (*P.*4.230), and the *sperma* of Arcesilas' multi-generational lineage (*P.*4.42)." The last passage mentioned by Miller is in fact a precise parallel to the use of the adjective here. With the political implications of the preceding lines, the prayer for contuation of the present prosperity does not only pertain to the victor and his father, but, since it is a prayer for the definitive restoration of the traditional aristocratic political set-up, fulfilment of the prayer would benefit their family as a whole, including future generations.

The noun **ὄπις**, cognate to words of vision with the stem *οπ- (see Frisk, Chantraine *s.v.;* Burkert, *MH* 37, 1981, 195 ff.), means 'regard.' It frequently occurs in the phrase θεῶν ὄπις of 'divine regard,' the thought being that the gods see whatever we do (θεοί ... ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες, *Od.*17.487; εἰ δὲ θεὸν ἀνήρ τις ἔλπεταί τι λαθέμεν ἔρδων, ἁμαρτάνει, *O.*1.64) with the implication that they reward the good and punish the wrong.

Since we are prone to ascribe our ill fate rather than our successes to divine interference, the phrase ὄπις θεῶν is used most frequently in a negative sense, referring to 'divine vengeance,' their punishment of those who transgress their laws. Cf. θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες, *Il.*16.338, Hes.*Op.*251;

[183] Thus Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al., Pitiche*, p. 580).

ἀτὰρ ϲιάλουϲ γε ϲύαϲ μνηϲτῆρεϲ ἔδουϲιν, | οὐκ ὄπιδα φρονέοντεϲ ἐνὶ φρεϲὶν οὐδ' ἐλεητύν. | οὐ μὲν ϲχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μάκαρεϲ φιλέουϲιν, | ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουϲι καὶ αἴϲιμα ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων, *Od.*14.81-4; καὶ μὲν τοῖϲ ὄπιδοϲ κρατερὸν δέοϲ ἐν φρεϲὶ πίπτει, 14.88; οὐδέ τι παιδὸϲ ἐνὶ μεγάροιϲ ἀλέγουϲιν | οὐδ' ὄπιδα τρομέουϲι θεῶν, 20.215; ὅϲ μιν ξεῖνον ἐόντα κατέκτανεν ᾧι ἐνὶ οἴκωι, | ϲχέτλιοϲ, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὄπιν ἠιδέϲατ' οὐδὲ τράπεζαν | τήν, ἥν οἱ παρέθηκεν, 21.27-9; πρίν γ' ἀπὸ τῶι δώωϲι κακὴν ὄπιν, ὅϲτιϲ ἁμάρτηι, Hes.*Th.*222, "Hesiod seems, like LSJ, to have understood the phrase θεῶν ὄπιν ... of divine punishment and not merely divine regard," West *ad loc.;* cf further Hes.*Op.*187, 706. Herodotus uses the phrase for the 'regard, reverence' which men pay to the gods (θεῶν being an objective instead of subjective gen.): ἀλλὰ θεοῖϲί τε ϲυμμάχοιϲι πίϲυνοί μιν ἐπέξιμεν ἀμυνόμενοι καὶ τοῖϲι ἥρωϲι, τῶν ἐκεῖνοϲ οὐδεμίαν ὄπιν ἔχων ἐνέπρηϲε τούϲ τε οἴκουϲ καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα, Hdt.8.143; τούϲδε ἀπολέϲαϲ τοὺϲ οὔτε δαιμόνων οὔτε θεῶν ὄπιν ἔχονταϲ, Hdt.9.76.

The noun occurs three times in Pindar, here and in two much disputed passages: In Θήρωνα ... ὄπι δίκαιον ξένων, ἔρειϲμ' Ἀκράγαντοϲ, εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν, *O.*2.5-7 (ὄπῑ Hermann: ὄπι, ὀπὶ codd, Π), it is clear that ὄπιϲ is used in the positive sense of 'regard, reverence,' ξένων being an objective genitive. The sense is unclear in: οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρὸϲ | μόχθοϲ ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὁπόϲαι δαπάναι | ἐλπίδων ἔκνιξ' ὄπιν, *I.*5.56-8, 'expenditure that stimulates regard for one's hopes' could perhaps mean 'wealth that is used for realising one's hopes'; but line 58 is under the suspicion of being corrupt.

73-76

For if someone has acquired good without long toil, he seems to many, a wise man among fools, to crest his life with well-planned means. But this does not lie in men's power.

73. εἰ γάρ τιϲ ἐϲλὰ πέπαται

The formulation is generic, but, as γάρ signals, meant to explain the preceding prayer. See interpretation, pp. 445-7. ἐϲλά has aristocratic connotations, denoting what befits a noble (see my note on *N.*3.29, pp. 630-8). The specific political reference of Δίκα in 71 helps to evoke these connotations. ἐϲλὰ πέπαται is a suitable phrase to refer to a change in the political set-up that restores to the aristocracy the opportunity of acting according to their status.

For some general observations on **εἰ**-clauses see my note on *N.*3.19 (pp. 282/3). For **πέπαται** cf. χρήματα ... ἀδίκωϲ ... πεπᾶϲθαι | οὐκ ἐθέλω, Sol.1.7/8 W.; βούλεο δ' εὐϲεβέων ὀλίγοιϲ ϲὺν χρήμαϲιν οἰκεῖν | ἢ πλουτεῖν ἀδίκωϲ χρήματα παϲάμενοϲ, Thgn.145/6; νομάδεϲϲι γὰρ ἐν Cκύθαιϲ ἀλᾶται ϲτρατῶν | ὃϲ ἀμαξιφόρητον οὐ πέπαται, *fr.*105b.1/2.

73. μὴ cὺν μακρῶι πόνωι

It is difficult to explain this phrase as deriving its relevance from circumstances of Aristomenes' victory. That he would have won his victory easily[184] is implausible, since ἔργωι in 80 stresses the effort that Aristomenes expended, and since in Pindar's frame of reference πόνοc is a necessary (athough not sufficient) condition of athletic achievement.[185] An application of these lines to the case at hand *per contrarium* (Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 467) is unsatisfactory too. See interpretation, pp. 444-7. 'Without long-lasting trouble' can be understood as parallel to κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν (and to Hesychia, for that matter), and as contrasting a long-lasting, painstaking restoration of aristocratic supremacy by force in an atmosphere of cτάcιc. For **πόνοc** referring to the 'labour' of an armed conflict, cf. ὃc Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρcεν, τελεύταcέν τε πόνουc Δαναοῖc, *P.*1.54; Αἴαντα, λαῶν | ἐν πόνοιc ἔκπλαγον Ἐνυαλίου, *I.*6.53/4; *Pae.*6.89, *P.*10.42. **μή** has a conditional value. It defines the condition on which τιc ἐcλὰ πέπαται is the *topic* of the assertion. See my note on *N.*5.14 (pp. 117/8).

For **cύν** cf. εἰ δὲ cὺν πόνωι εὖ πράccοι, *O.*11.4; contrast καὶ δὴ πέπρακται τοὔργον οὐ μακρῶι πόνωι, A.*Pr.*75.

74. πολλοῖc coφὸc δοκεῖ πεδ' ἀφρόνων

If someone has acquired ἐcλά without long-lasting trouble, 'he seems to many clever among fools.' The general but wrong view is that such a man is cleverly in control of his own destiny. **coφόc** here has connotations of 'shrewd, clever,' in a practical way; the political context (see interpretation, pp. 444-7) evokes the specific connotation 'statesmanlike': someone who is capable of bringing about a reversal of the balance of power, to his own advantage, and of doing so with ease, in a peaceful way, appears to be a dexterous politician. Xenarces may have been liable to this charge. But Pindar emphasizes that such an assessment is unjustified, because what may seem to have been brought about by his dexterity, was in fact caused by divine interference (*in concreto* by Apollo, who granted Aristomenes his victory).

For coφόc in this sense, cf. χρυcοῦ κιβδήλοιο καὶ ἀργύρου ἀνcχετὸc ἄτη | Κύρνε, καὶ ἐξευρεῖν ῥάιδιον ἀνδρὶ coφῶι, Thgn.119/20; ἄνωγε γάρ cε τὴν αὐθαδίαν | μεθέντ' ἐρευνᾶν τὴν coφὴν εὐβουλίαν. | πιθοῦ, coφῶι γὰρ αἰcχρὸν ἐξαμαρτάνειν, A.*Pr.*1037-9; νῦν ὦν εἴ τινα ἔχειc coφίην, μηχανῶ ὡc ἂν ἡμεῖc cχῶμεν τοῦτο τὸ γέραc καὶ μὴ ἄλλοc τιc, Hdt.3.85; cf. 1.60, 68, 2.172, 3.4,

---

[184] Thus Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 73); Giannini, *QUCC* 49, 1995, 53 with n. 65 (repeated in his note *ad loc.* in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, pp. 580/1). Cf. Méautis, *Pindare le Dorien*, p. 363; Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 212).

[185] Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 467.

127, 4.46, 5.21, 9.62. Cf. also the connextion of σοφός with Πειθώ in *P.*9.39/39a

For the general nexus of ideas, it is instructive to compare: ὑπ' ἀμαχανίας ἄγων ἐς φάος τόνδε δᾶμον ἀστῶν (*sc.* Psaumis)· | αἰεὶ δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖσι πόνος δαπάνα τε μάρναται πρὸς ἔργον | κινδύνωι κεκαλυμμένον· εὖ δὲ τυχόντες σοφοὶ καὶ πολίταις ἔδοξαν ἔμμεν, *O.*5.14-6. As in our passage, σοφός is how the many qualify the one who has achieved success. Contrary to *h.l.*, the topic is success that has been achieved with toil and expenditure. Moreover, whereas in *O.*5 the success is explicitly connected with the common good of the community (cf. also line 4), the context here focusses more upon the polarisation between two groups in one and the same community, the παχέες and the δῆμος. However, since καὶ, *O.*5.16, seems to presuppose an idea of the type κακολόγοι δὲ πολῖται, *P.*11.28, in *O.*5, too, there is a tension to be felt between the aristocratic well-doer and the citizens of his community (cf. also *O.*2.93-100). In *O.*5, the tenor is 'he who expends toil and cost in attempting to achieve success is wise; if he does in fact succeed, even his fellow citizens think so.' For the idea of success giving the impression of being clever or wise cf. further: εἰ δ' εὖ γ' ἔπραξα, κάρτ' ἂν ἐν σοφοῖσιν ἦ, E.*Hipp.*700; τὸν εὐτυχοῦντα καὶ φρονεῖν νομίζομεν, E.*fr.*1017 N.; ἔστιν δ' ἐν ὄλβωι καὶ τόδ' οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἔχον, | εὐψυχίας δόκησις· οἰόμεσθα γὰρ | τὸν εὐτυχοῦντα πάντ' ἐπίστασθαι καλῶς, E.*Heracl.*745-7 (with Wilkins *ad loc.*).[186]

Epode Δ

75. βίον κορυσσέμεν ὀρθοβούλοισι μαχαναῖς

Someone who achieves success without toils seems cleverly 'to marshal his life with well-counseled means.' He seems to the πολλοί to be in control over his own life, 'marshaling' it with well deviced plans and tricks.

The verb **κορύσσομαι** literally means 'cresting,' putting on one's κόρυς[187]; it is used in the more general sense of putting on one's armour. As Homeric heroes always dress themselves, the verb occurs only in the middle in this sense. Cf. Αἴας δὲ κορύσσετο νώροπι χαλκῶι, *Il.*7.206; τεύχεσι Πηλεΐδαο κορυσσόμενον θείοιο, *Il.*17.199; 4.274, 5.562. The active is found only in the metaphorical sense, of 'mar-

---

[186] In τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν | πειρώμενον ἀγωνίας δυσφρονᾶν παραλύει, *O.*2.51/2, Dindorf's δυσφρονᾶν is certainly correct (ἀφροσύνας Bowra e Σ.).

[187] Thus, metaphorically, of 'crested waves'; cf. ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐν αἰγιαλῶι πολυηχέϊ κῦμα θαλάσσης | ὄρνυτ' ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὕπο κινήσαντος· | πόντωι μέν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα | χέρσωι ῥηγνύμενον μεγάλα βρέμει, *Il.*4.422-5; ἅ τε κῦμα θαλάλλης | τρηχὺ θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κορύσσεται, A.R.2.70/1; in the active: οὐδὲ Σκάμανδρος ἔληγε τὸ ὃν μένος, ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον | χώετο Πηλεΐωνι, κόρυσσε δὲ κῦμα ῥόοιο | ὑψόσ' ἀειρόμενος, *Il.*21.305-7, 'make crested.'

shaling' one's troops. Cf. ὢ πόποι, ἦ δὴ μυρί' Ὀδυςςεὺς ἐςθλὰ ἔοργεν | βουλάς τ' ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς πόλεμόν τε κορύςςων, *Il.*2.272/3; μάχας ἐναριμβρότου | ἔργον ἐν πεδίωι κορύςςοντα, *I.*8.53/4; δεινὴ Ἔρις πεπότητο κορύςςουςα κλόνον ἀνδρῶν, Hes.*Sc.*148; μάχην ἐθέλουςα κορύςςειν, *ibid.*198; cf. E.*Rh.*933.

Here Pindar uses the active in a sense that further extends the common metaphorical usage of the verb by using it in a non-martial context, with the object βίον instead of a noun referring to war or battle.

The noun **μαχανά** denotes 'means,' the instrument, tool, or capacity enabling one to do something.

Cf. πάςηι μηχανῆι, Ar.*Lys.*300; μηδιμίηι μηχανῆι, Hdt.7.51, etc. It is often used in a concrete, material sense ('machine,' Hdt.2.125; 'war-machine,' Th.2.76, 4.13; 'stage-crane,' Pl.*Cra.*425d, *Clit.*407a).

When used in an immaterial, mental sense, it may refer to a means though of to accomplish one's aims, 'a cunning plan.'

Cf. θάρψει, παρέςται μηχανὴ δραςτήριος, A.*Th.*1041; μηχανὰς εὑρήςομεν | ὥςτ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ςε τῶνδ' ἀπαλλάξαι πόνων, A.*Eu.*82/3, etc. In this sense, the noun not seldom has negative connotations, so as to come close to being synonymous to δόλος: cf. δεινοὶ πλέκειν τοι μηχανὰς Αἰγύπτιοι, A.*fr.*373 R.; ἐννυχίοις μαχαναῖς, S.*Aj.*181; ςοφιςτῶν μηχαναί, Pl.*Lg.*908d; cf. also νῦν ὦν εἴ τινα ἔχεις ςοφίην, μηχανῶ ὡς ἂν ἡμεῖς ςχῶμεν τοῦτο τὸ γέρας καὶ μὴ ἄλλος τις, Hdt.3.85.

The noun can also be used to refer to the capacities needed for finding means to accomplish one's goals.

Cf. ἐκ θεῶν γὰρ μαχαναὶ πᾶςαι βροτέαις ἀρεταῖς, | καὶ ςοφοὶ καὶ χερςὶ βιαταὶ περίγλωςςοί τ' ἔφυν, *P.*1.41/2, where the second line quoted narrows down the reference of μαχαναί, 'means,' of accomplishing ἀρεταί to 'capacities, skills,' needed to accomplish them; μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον | ςπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, *P.*3.61/2; δαίμον' ἀςκήςω κατ' ἐμὰν θεραπεύων μαχανάν, *P.*3.109. For μαχανά referring to the poet's 'means, resources', i.e., his 'skill,' see my note on line 34 above (p. 518).

The reference of the noun here is either the 'capacity, recourcefulness,' that enables a man to arrange his life as he wants, or the manifestations of this capacity, 'clever plans, tricks.' The plural pleads in favour of the latter option, as does the fact that the capacity of the man has already been referred to by ςοφός. Distincly negative connotations are absent. The terms ςοφός and ὀρθοβούλοιςι μαχαναῖς, describing how the πολλοί think about such a man, probably reflect that common mixture of admiration and moral disqualification.

For **ὀρθόβουλος** cf. ἔνθεν δ' ὔμμι Λατοίδας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον | ςὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄςτυ χρυςοθρόνου | διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας | ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις, *P.*4.259-62, "it is the practical, not the moral aspect ... which is implied," Braswell *ad loc.*; τῆς ὀρθοβούλου Θέμιδος, A.*Pr.*18. Cf. also εὔβουλος, *O.*13.8, *I.*8.31, *fr.*30.1.

76. τὰ δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνδράcι κεῖται

'But this is not in the power of men.' This sentence refutes the view of the πολλοί that successes achieved without trouble are a manifestation of cleverness. Men have no influence in this matter. If such luck occurs, it is because of divine favour. For the expression cf. ἐν δ' ἀγαθοῖcι κεῖνται | πατρώϊαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάcιες, *P.*10.71/2; ἀλλ' ἦ τοι μὲν ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούναcι κεῖται, *Il.*17.514, 20.435, *Od.*1.267.

τὰ δ' could be the fossilized adverbial expression signalling antithesis, as in line 28 above. However, the audience's familiarity with the Homer verse[188] may lead them to regard τά as anaphoric. Then τά refers to ἐcλά (73);[189] these 'do not lie with men,' which implies that their distribution is not in men's power. One could, alternatively, refer τά to the whole idea of accomplishing ἐcλά without long-lasting trouble, but the following lines focus upon the idea that divine power grants favours and takes them away. A man cannot himself influence whether he will get ἐcλά or not, let alone whether he will get them easily.

76-78

This the deity provides, tossing on high now one, now another; casting another man below his hands, he enters the arena with measure.

76-77. δαίμων δὲ παρίcχει, | ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων

ὕπερθε βάλλων signifies the δαίμων's favouring human, ὑπὸ χείρων his disfavouring. The image is drawn from wrestling, the sport in which the victor has excelled himself. The δαίμων's influence upon human affairs is described in terms of his wrestling with humans. ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων is a postposed participle clasue with δαίμων δὲ παρίcχει. ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χείρων is a preposed participle clause to be connected with the following μέτρωι καταβαίνει. A point above the line is to be printed after βάλλων, a comma after χειρῶν. See next note. The particle δ' coordinates the two sentences.[190] βάλλων is to be supplied with ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χείρων, which results in a remarkable *zeugma*.

There is, at first sight, an element of illogicity in ὕπερθε βάλλων as a symbol for divine favour: "if God did that to the victor, the victor would hardly thank him, for to be thrown up into the air in

[188] "An echo of *Od.*1.267 may well be intended," Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 466.
[189] Thus Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 581).
[190] Contrast Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 212.

wrestling means a very bad fall" (Farnell, *ad loc.*, II, p. 198). For some scholars this is a reason to suggest that the image is not from wrestling,[191] others insist that we are not to take the image too literally.[192] An attractive possibility, at first sight, is to take ὕπερθε βάλλων to mean 'throwing the victor above the prostrate victim,' i.e., 'putting him on top.'[193] The picture, then, is a wrestling match between two combatants, one winner and one loser, referred to by ἄλλον ... ἄλλον δ', the δαίμων steering the match between the two as an outsider. This is problematic. The δαίμων's actions described in line 77 suggest that he is doing the wrestling himself, rather than steering it as an outsider.[194] As I argue below (pp. 653-65), the δαίμων is the subject of καταβαίνει (78): he 'enters the list', which pleads strongly in favour of taking him to be actively involved in the actual wrestling. Also, this goes better with the fact that ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον, 'now one, now another' (viz. those favoured by the δαίμων), is followed by an additional ἄλλον δ', 'yet another', viz. someone who is disfavoured by the δαίμων. Thus, line 77 describes a series of wrestling matches between the δαίμων and an unspecified number of successive human opponents. In other words, the χεῖρες are his.[195]

All in all, the most natural interpretation of ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων is 'tossing on high now one, now another.' In other words, the δαίμων's favouring persons is expressed in terms of him tossing people in the air like a wrestler tosses on high his opponent. This leaves us with the at first sight strange implication that the process of raising an opponent in the air normally is the prelude to giving him a mighty fall. On closer consideration, however, this association may be functional. The idea of bliss not being unlimited, of every ascension inevitably being followed by a downfall, is very much present in

---

[191] Some scholars have suggested that the metaphor is drawn from ball-play (Dissen, Christ, Fennel, Farnell, Gildersleeve; *AP* 10.80 is quoted as a parallel for the idea). The personal reference of ἄλλον ... ἄλλον makes this very unlikely ('throwing men' evokes associations with combat sports; in order to initiate a cognitive progress on the part of the hearer that runs along the lines of 'the δαίμων throws men, as if he is throwing balls', an additional signal would certainly be required). Moreover, ὑπὸ χείρων is easier to understand in the context of wrestling than with balls.

[192] "The poet may be allowed a hazy idea idea of the art of wrestling, and in any case his words are not to be judged by a strict standard of technical correctness," Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 187. Cf. Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 213.

[193] Thus Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 233; Lloyd-Jones, *ProcBritAc* 68, 1982, 161; Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 466 with n. 10; Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, p. 581). Cf. LSJ *s.v.* βάλλω (A.ii.6).

[194] Cf. Farnell *ad loc.*, p. 198.

[195] Miller's "beneath the hands [*sc.* of his opponent]", has the disadvantage of assuming a different owner of the hands than the subject of the sentence. If that were meant, one would wish an additional signal for that.

the following discourse. ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν, | μέτρωι καταβαίνει (77/8) states that the δαίμων enters the arena in order to draw the line, by disfavouring one. By 'casting down men below his hands,' the δαίμων terminates his favouring them. The idea is elaborated upon further by the final triad; the idea of success easily turning into failure is expressed explicitly in ἐν δ' ὀλίγωι βροτῶν | τὸ τερπνὸν αὔξεται· οὕτω δὲ καὶ πίτνει χαμαί (92/3), where πίτνει χαμαί may be said to echo the fall implied in ὕπερθε βάλλων. In other words, ὕπερθε signifies success; the combination with βάλλων, evoking the picture of being thrown up into the air, like a wrestler, in anticipation of a mighty fall, adds the idea of success and divine favours being limited. The δαίμων may turn the table on us just like that. The very assertion that it is in the δαίμων's power to favour humans is pregnant with the idea that he is able to bring them down just as easily.

This procedure of illustrating the instability of divine favour by means of semantic ambiguity, has much resemblance with the following passage: εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισι, ἄνευ καμάτου | οὐ φαίνεται· ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν ἤτοι σάμερον | δαίμων· τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν· ἀλλ' ἔσται χρόνος | οὗτος, ὃ καί τιν' ἀελπτίαι βαλὼν | ἔμπαλιν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώσει, τὸ δ' οὔπω, *P.*12.28-32. Pindar exploits the ambiguity inherent in the verb ἐκτελευτάω: it means both 'bring to fulfillment' and 'bring to an end.' The preceding context leads one to interpret that the δαίμων will bring happiness to fulfillment; τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν comments upon the idea that the δαίμων will annihilate happiness (thus, in retrospect, leading the hearer to re-assess the interpretation that is the most natural as a sequel to εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισι, ἄνευ καμάτου | οὐ φαίνεται). The very assertion that it is in the δαίμων's power to bring about ὄλβος is pregnant with the idea that he is able to annihilate it just as easily. For more details, see *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 410-2.

• *Semantics:* On the level of the *vehicle*, **βάλλω** refers to 'throwing, casting' up one's opponent in a wrestling match.

For βάλλω referring to 'throwing, casting' in the context of wrestling, cf., e.g., κὰδ δ' ἔβαλ' ἐξοπίσω, *Il.*23.727, in the wrestling match between Ajax and Odysseus. For raising an opponent in the air as the prelude to giving him a mighty fall, cf. ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἱδρείηι τε καὶ ἀλκῆι | πλευρὸν ὑποκλίνας Τελαμώνιον ὄβριμον υἷα | ἀνάειρεν ὑπὸ μυῶνος ἐρείσας | ὦμον, καὶ ποδὶ μηρὸν ὑποπλίξας ἑτέρωσε | κάββαλεν ὄβριμον ἄνδρα κατὰ χθονός, Q.S.4.228-30, in a wrestling match between Ajax and Diomedes. The technique is unsuccessful in δεύτερος αὖτ' ἀνάειρε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, | κίνησεν δ' ἄρα τυτθὸν ἀπὸ χθονός, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἄειρεν, | ἐν δὲ γόνυ γνάμψεν, *Il.*23.729-31.

The use of ὕπερθε here, referring to a throw 'high up into the air' (on the level of the *vehicle*), can be compared to εἰς ὕψος ἀναβαστάσαι τὸν ἀντίπαλον, Lucian.*Anacharsis* 24.26/7. Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, pp. 383/4, takes this to refer to the technique known in modern wrestling as the flying mare. Cf. his figs. 114, 115, 54.

On the level of the *tenor*, ὕπερθε βάλλω refers to 'favouring.' Cf. (θεὸc) ὃc ἀνέχει τοτὲ μὲν τὰ κείνων, τότ αὖθ' ἑτέροιc ἔδωκεν μέγα κῦδοc, *P.*2.89. "Various words denoting height are often used in an encomiastic sense,"[196] evoking connotations of superiority.

Cf., e.g., εὐαγορηθεὶc κέρδοc ὕψιcτον δέκεται, *I.*1.51; cτέφανον ὕψιcτον δέδεκται, *P.*1.100; αὐτοῦ μένων δ' ὁ θεῖοc ἀνὴρ (*sc.* 'Αντίλοχοc) | πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρόc, | ἐδόκηcέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾶι | ὁπλοτέροιcιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέcαιc | ὕπατοc ἀμφὶ τοκεῦcιν ἔμμεν πρὸc ἀρετάν. | τὰ μὲν παρίκει· τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θραcύβουλοc | πατρῴιαν μάλιcτα πρὸc cτάθμαν ἔβα, | πάτρωι τ' ἐπερχόμενοc ἀγλαΐαν {ἔδειξεν} ἅπαcαν, *P.*6.38-46; γνώτ' ἀείδω θεῶι τε καὶ ὅcτιc ἁμιλλᾶται περὶ | ἐcχάτων ἀέθλων κορυφαῖc. ὕπατον δ' ἔcχεν Πίcα | 'Ηρακλέοc τεθμόν, *N.*10.31-3; cf. *O.*4.3, *O.*5.1, lines 4 and 27 above. The gods are 'high' (*O.*1.42, *O.*13.24, *fr.*75.11, cf. also *Pyth.*4.36). Cf. also line 81 below. The usage occurs in other authors, too. Cf. the phrase καθύπερθεν εἶναι/γίγνεcθαι, Hdt.1.67, 5.69, 8.19, 8.60, 8.136. See also Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 466 n. 10.

In Pindar's frame of reference, superiority and success go hand in hand. Thus words denoting height may be used as a symbol for success, happiness and glory.

Cf. εἴη cέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν, *O.*1.115, "'to walk high' means simply to enjoy great success", Gerber *ad loc.* (p. 176); ὅταν θεοῦ Μοῖρα πέμπηι | ἀνεκὰc ὄλβον ὑψηλόν, *O.*2.21/2; εἰ δέ μοι πλοῦτον θεὸc ἁβρὸν ὀρέξαι, | ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέοc εὑρέcθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόcω, *P.*3.110-1.

βάλλων has exactly the same position in the epode as βάλλω in 57 (Schroeder *ad loc.*, p. 74). An attempt to make this echo productive for the interpretation would lead to the observation that it draws a parallel between ὕπερθε βάλλων and cτεφάνοιcι βάλλω, the treatment of a victor, thereby helping to underscore the association of ὕπερθε βάλλων with victory.

77. ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χείρων

'(Casting) another beneath his hands.' βάλλων is to be supplied from the preceding clause.[197] ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χείρων is a preposed (participle) clause to be connected with the following μέτρωι καταβαίνει. See preceding note. βάλλω ὑπὸ χειρῶν is a comprimated expression referring to throwing one's opponent down onto the ground and pushing him down under one's hands so as to defeat him. ὑπὸ χειρῶν, evok-

---

[196] Gerber on *O.*1.115 (p. 176).

[197] A listening audience would at first hold off interpreting the accusative on the assumption that the main verb, when it comes, will provide the necessary construction. However, there is no way of taking καταβαίνει as transitive and causal (see appendix, pp. 654-9); having been thus frustrated in their attempts to construe ἄλλον with καταβαίνει, the audience will be forced to go back and supply βάλλων.

ing the image of a wrestler being pressed to the ground under the hands of his opponent, refers to helpless subjection to superior power, to defeat and humiliation.

The adjective ὑποχείριος has exactly the same connotations. Cf. εὖ κώτιλλε τὸν ἐχθρόν· ὅταν δ' ὑποχείριος ἔλθηι, | τεῖσαί μιν πρόφασιν μηδεμίαν θέμενος, Thgn.363/4; μή τί ποτ' οὖν γενοίμαν ὑποχείριος | κράτεσιν ἀρσένων, A.*Supp*.392/3; τήνδ' (*sc.* πόλιν) ἐπεξελθεῖν θέλω | στρατηλατήσας χὐποχείριον λαβεῖν, E.*Andr*.735/6; Hdt.1.106, 3.154, 5.91, 6.45, Th.3.11, Pl.*Lg*.683d, X.*An*.3.2.3, etc. See also Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 466 n. 10. In general, also without associations of wrestling, 'lowness,' may symbolize inferiority and defeat (cf. *N*.3.80-2 with my note on ταπαινά, p. 417). Cf. esp. ζώιης μοι καθύπερθεν | χειρὶ καὶ πλούτωι τεῶν ἐχθρῶν ὅσον | νῦν ὑπόχειρ ναίεις, S.*El*.1090-3, 'may I yet see thy life raised in might and wealth above thy foes, even as now it is humbled bebeath their hands' (Jebb), where the contrast between success and humiliation is, as it is here, expressed in wrestling metaphors, terms of a contrast between being 'high' and 'below one's hands.'

Cf. also τῶ κε τάχ' ἠμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος | χερσὶν ὑφ' ἡμετέρηισιν ἁλοῦσά τε περθομένη τε, *Il*.2.374/5; καὶ τῶν κατὰ κράτος ἀναλώτων τειχέων τῆι φιλανθρωπίαι ὑπὸ χεῖρα ἐποιεῖτο, X.*Ag*.1.22; ὁρῶ γὰρ ὡς τὰ πόλλ' ἐνίους οὐκ εἰς τοὺς αἰτίους, ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς ὑπὸ χεῖρα μάλιστα τὴν ὀργὴν ἀφιέντας, D.6.34.

For βάλλω ὑπὸ χειρῶν, cf. βαλὼν δ' ὑπὸ νηδύα χεῖρα | ἐσσυμένως ἐέηκε κατὰ χθονός ἠΰτε πέτρην | ἀλκῆι ὑπὸ στιβαρῆι, Q.S.4.259-61; cf. also ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοίως ὑπὸ χείρεσι δηριόωντο, Q.S.4.255; Αἴας | Τυδείδην συνέμαρψεν ὑπὸ στιβαρῆισι χέρεσσιν, Q.S.4.224/5.

For **ὑπό** with the genitive with a verb of motion, cf. καί τοτ' ἐγὼ τὸν μοχλὸν ὑπὸ σποδοῦ ἤλασα πολλῆς, *Od*.9.375; καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης | πέμψαν, Hes.*Th*.717/8. Cf. further πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη | ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας, *O*.2.83/4; λαβὼν ὑπὸ μάλης ἐγχειρίδιον, Pl.*Grg*.469d; ξιφίδια ὑπὸ μάλης ἔχοντας, X.*HG* 2.3.23; ὑπ' ἀνθερεῶνος ὀχεὺς τέτατο, *Il*.3.372; ὑπὸ γῆς, Pl.*Ap*.48e, *Phdr*.249a, etc. See further J. Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque*, pp. 320/1; Schwyzer, II, pp. 527/8; Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, p. 435; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 168/9 (§ 187).

Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 233, takes χειρῶν to be the participle of χειρόω, interpreting ὑπό as an adverb: 'la Divinité mettant l'un au-dessus, et, au-dessous, affaiblissant l'autre.' This is quite unlikely. First, the position of the adverb before the participle is awkward, especially because of the ensuing ambiguity: it could easily be 'misinterpreted' as a preposition with a following noun in the genitive. Second, Taillardat's interpretation would result in unfunctional redundancy, since both the participle and the adverb would express the idea of subjection and inferiority. Third, the verb χειρόω does not occur elsewhere in lyric or epic diction. Fourth, it is very rare in the active.[198]

[198] See LSJ *s.v.*; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 168 (§ 187).

78. μέτρωι καταβαίνει

These two words pose considerable difficulties. The text is uncertain. The interpretation is a matter of much dispute. In the appendix (pp. 653-65) I argue that μέτρωι καταβαίνει must be what Pindar wrote. The δαίμων is the subject of the verb. δ' in 77 coordinates the two main verbs παρίcχει and καταβαίνει. A comma can be printed after παρίcχει, a semi-colon after βάλλων, and a full stop after καταβαίνει. The wrestling imagery in line 77 strongly evokes the agonistic connotation of καταβαίνει: 'stepping down into the arena'. Line 77 describes a series of wrestling matches between the δαίμων and an unspecified number of successive human opponents. The δαίμων's influence upon human affairs is metaphorically described in terms of the δαίμων wrestling with us. He successively favours different persons ('tossing on high now one, now another'). By disfavouring a person, the δαίμων draws the line, and effects the termination of his favours.

78-80

At Megara you have a prize, and on the plain of Marathon, and you conquered the local contest of Hera in three victories, Aristomenes, by your action.

78. Μεγάροις δ' ἔχεις γέρας

Aristomenes has won an earlier victory at Megara, probably at the Pythian Games. One would expect that the lack of specification indicates that the most famous festival is meant. Moreover, if indeed the Pythian games are meant, specification is unnecessary since Pythian Apollo is already present in the context. For this and the other Megarean festivals, see my note on *N.*3.84 (p. 421). For **γέρας** referring to an athletic prize, cf. Ὀλυμπίαι μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸc γέρας ἔδεκτο, *O.*2.49; *O.*8.11, *P.*5.31, *N.*8.25. For the deleted ἐν see the appendix pp. 662-4.

• *Coordination:* Although the wrestling imagery in 77/8 helps to smoothen the transition to the catalogue of Aristomenes' earlier victories, there is a sudden shift of *topic*. The second person form of the predicate ἔχεις serves as a signal to dissociate the new *topic* from the preceding one, which was the δαίμων; the vocative in line 80 then unequivocally identifies the new *topic* as Aristomenes. For similar unexpected second person addresses of the victor cf. *N.*3.76 and *N.*5.43-6 with my notes (pp. 394, 172/3). The particle **δ'** marks this sentence as just another independent step in the sequence, as if it were on a par with the preceding sentences, whereas it is in fact, as far as the content is concerned, a substantial incision in the train of thought. See my introduction pp. 28-30.

79. μυχῶι τ' ἐν Μαραθῶνος

In Marathon the Heracleia were held. Cf. *O.*9.89/90 with Σ. 134e and 137a (I 299 Dr.), *O.*13.110, Hdt. 6.108, 116, Arist.*Ath.*54.7, Paus.1.15.3, 1.32.4. See Kramer, *Studien zur griechischen Agonistik*, p. 44; Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, pp. 46/7; Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians*, pp. 181 ff. The scholiast thinks of the Panathenea (113b., II 217 Dr.).

μυχός means 'hollow, deep'[199]; cf. (Aetna) τᾶς ἐρεύγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἁγνόταται | ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί, *P.*1.20/1; ἐς μυχοὺς | ἁλός, *P.*6.12/3. It is used to refer to the interior of a room in ἐς θαλάμου μυχὸν εὐρὺν ἔβαν, *N.*1.42. In geographical contexts it refers to a 'hollow, glen, plain, valley'; cf. *O.*3.26, *O.*10.33, *P.*5.68, *P.*10.8, *N.*10.42, *I.*1.56; cf. also *P.*6.12. Marathon lies on the plain between Pentelicon and Parnes. The various usages of μυχός are quite similar to those of γύαλον (see my note on line 63 above).

79-80. Ἥρας τ' ἀγῶν' ἐπιχώριον | νίκαις τρισσαῖς, ὠριστόμενες, δάμασσας ἔργωι

ἐπιχώριον is 'local' from the perspective of the Aeginetan audience (cf. *N.*5.44 with my note, p. 175). We know nothing more about the Aeginetan Heraea than the scholiast tells us: ὡς καὶ ἐν Αἰγίνηι Ἡραίων ἀγομένων κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ ἐν Ἄργει ἀγῶνος· ἄποικοι γὰρ Ἀργείων. Δίδυμος δέ φησι τὰ Ἑκατόμβαια αὐτὸν νῦν λέγειν ἐπιχώριον ἀγῶνα Αἰγινητῶν διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν (113c, II 217 Dr.).

See further Kramer, *Studien zur griechischen Agonistik*, p. 27; Bernardini, *Stadion* 2, 1976, 213 ff. For a historical connection of Aegina and Argos, cf. Σ. *ad O.*8.30 (39ab, I 246/7 Dr.), Σ. *ad P.*8.20 (29ab, II 209 Dr.), Str.8.6.16, Paus.2.9.5; cf. also Hdt.5.86.4, 5.88. See further Figueira, *Aegina*, pp. 172 ff.; Giannini on lines 39 ff. (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 573).

For **δαμάζω** used of athletic victory[200] cf. φῶτας δ' ὀξυρεπεῖ δόλωι | ἀπτωτὶ δαμάσσαις, *O.*9.91/2, where the opponents are the object of the verb. For the construction of a verb meaning 'win, overcome, subdue' with an object referring to the place where the victory was won, cf. τοὺς στεφανίτας ἀγῶνας νικᾶν, X.*Mem.*3.7.1; κρατούσηι τὸν ἀγῶν', D.21.18. The closest Pindaric parallels are ἐκράτησε δὲ καί ποθ' Ἕλλανα στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, τύχαι τε μολὼν | καὶ τὸν Ἰσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέαι στέφανον, *N.*10.25/6; ἀμφότεροι κράτησαν | μίαν ἔργον ἀν' ἁμέραν, *O.*9.84/5 (for ἔργον in this sense cf. *O.*13.38).

---

[199] "μυχός bedeutet niemals 'Winkel,' sondern das 'Innere,' die 'Tiefe' u.ä," Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 281 n. 12.

[200] For the verb see further my note on *N.*3.23 (p. 297).

ἔργωι, 'with deed,' is here used in the pregnant sense of 'with action,' emphasizing the effort (μετ' ἔργου καὶ ἐνεργείας πολλῆς καθυπέταξας cαυτῶι, Σ.116, II 217 Dr.). Cf. cιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν ἔργωι φυγών, *P.*9.92; τίς δὴ ποταίνιον | ἔλαχε cτέφανον | χείρεccι ποςίν τε καὶ ἅρματι, | ἀγώνιον ἐν δόξαι θέμενος εὖχος, ἔργωι καθελών; *O.*10.60-3; ἦν δ' ἐcορᾶν καλός, ἔργωι τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων, *O.*8.19.

τριccόc occurs only here in Pindar. But cf. S.*OT* 164, *OC* 479, E.*Hec.*645, Pl.*R.*504a. For the crasis with ὦ, cf. line 67 above, *P.*4.250 (with Braswell, *ad loc.*), *I.*1.6, *I.*5.6, *Pae.*13d.4, *fr.*205.2. See further Kambylis, *Anredeformen*, pp. 184ff.

Strophe E

81-87

You fell from high above on four bodies, meaning them harm. For them the result in the Pythian festival was not a sweet home-coming like yours; nor, when they returned to their mothers, did sweet laughter rouse joy all around. Down narrow alleys, out of their enemies way, they shrink back, bitten by their misfortune.

81-87. The Defeated Contestants

It has often been noted that, "for a poet who is stimulated by a specific event, Pindar is remarkable for his reluctance to describe the victory which occasions the ode."[201] The short description of the contest here (81/2), combined with the emphasis upon the misery of the defeated contestants (83-7) is, for the *corpus Pindaricum*, paralleled only by: ἀνορέας δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακὼν | ἐν τέτραcιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοις | νόcτον ἔχθιcτον καὶ ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶccαν καὶ ἐπίκρυφον οἶμον, *O.*8.67-9 (also for an Aeginetan boy wrestler). Vivid descriptions of the contest itself, so familiar to us from our modern media, do not occur in Pindar's odes. As a contrast, Bacchylides does give such descriptions on two occasions (5.37-49, 9.27-39; cf. also Sim.*fr.*516, 517 *PMG*, if these are rightly assigned to the *epinicia*).

Pindar's reluctancy to include vivid descriptions of athletic contests is sometimes ascribed to his supposedly being detatched from the occasional and his alledged tendency toward generalities and timelessness, which would be motivated by his Panhellenic ambitions (see also introduction, pp. 7-11). This explanation calls for a re-assessment. First, the underlying presupposition that a Panhellenic audience would not be interested in details about the contest itself is by

[201] Carey, *Passionate Intellect*, p. 91. "Fortunately enough, the genre did not require Pindar to report that 'our man was running strongly in second place on the inside track, but then with the final lap ...'", Carne-Ross, *Pindar*, 14.

no means self-evident. Second, although actual match reports are not to be found in Pindar, memorable particularities of specific victories are sometimes mentioned or alluded to. E.g., in ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ', *I*.1.15, it is explicitly said that the owner of the chariot competed in person instead of appointing a jockey. ἐν τεσσαράκοντα γὰρ | πετόντεσσι ἀνιόχοις ὅλον | δίφρον κομίξαις ἀταρβεῖ φρενί, *P*.5.49-51, refers to the spectacular circumstance that fourty fellow competitors did not make it to the mark. In φῶτας δ' ὀξυρεπεῖ δόλωι | ἀπτωτὶ δαμάσσαις, *O*.9.91/2 (wrestler), δόλωι refers to some kind of trickery, if not cheating, which enabled the victor to win without conceding a single point to his opponents. The medical terminology in καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν | ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν ἐν βαθυπεδίωι Νεμέαι τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει, *N*.3.17/8, and ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων | ἰατρός· αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ | Μοισᾶν θύγατρες ἀοιδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἁπτόμεναι. | οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει | γυῖα, τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος, *N*.4.1-5 (both for a pancratiast), suggests that in both cases the victor was wounded (see my note on *N*.3.17/8, pp. 276-7). These and similar passages show that Pindar does not have an aversion to adventitious detail, as it is sometimes claimed. The passages quoted have in common that they commemorate unusual circumstances of the victory, details that add to the glory of the victor's achievement. The obvious conclusion is that Pindar is led by his encomiastic aims. Although we can only speculate, it is not difficult to imagine that a detailed match report that is honest would often imply references to stages in the contest in which the later victor was in an awkward position, references that would challenge the image of the victor's unchallenged superiority. Whereas an impartial narrator is interested in describing excitingly close contests because of his concerns for suspense (the description of the funeral games for Patroclus in *Iliad* 23 provides many examples), a poet of *epinicia* is interested only in those details that contribute to his encomiastic aim, which is to add to the victor's glory. Perhaps Pindar is indeed stricter in this than Bacchylides, although the two descriptions of contests that occur there are firmly encomiastic.

Our passage here and *O*.8.67-9 have in common that the number of opponents is specified. As I will argue below, we have reason to believe that the explicit reference to four opponents is equivalent to proud claims, found elsewhere, of victors having won the tournament without once having been ἔφεδρος. This makes lines 81/2 here and *O*.8.68 understandable as references to an honourable particularity of the victory at hand. In our passage this complimentary factuality is exploited as an occasion to visualize the victor's superiority (ἔμπετες ὑψόθεν) and his fierce, aggressive attitude, as it is em-

phasized by the martial terminology (see my notes below).

The evocative lines that graphically depict the misery of the defeated contestants, both here and in *O*.8, obviously provide an effective contrast to the victor's happiness. One wonders why the epinician poets did not exploit this ready device more often. This is quite a difficult question to answer, perhaps the wrong question to ask. In any case, our modern concepts of sportsmanship are irrelevant to Pindar's age. Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 189, rightly reminds us of the Homeric custom of insulting a fallen warrior. It is clear that in *P*.8 the description of the misery of the defeated contestants ties in closely with the theme of the final triad as a whole: it compellingly presents misfortune as the shadow of success, thus preparing for the passage about the instability of fate that is to follow.

81-82. τέτραϲι δ' ἔμπετεϲ ὑψόθεν | ϲωμάτεϲϲι κακὰ φρονέων

'You fell from high above on four bodies, meaning them harm.' After the catalogue of Aristomenes' previous victories (65/6, 78-80) has been completed, attention shifts to his most recent victory (cf. ἐν Πυθιάδι, 84). Aristomenes is portrayed as a fierce and aggressive warrior, who was very much superior to his opponents.

The victor has beaten four opponents in order to win the title. This number of opponents is found frequently. Cf. *O*.8.68 (cited in the preceding note); Μαινάλιοϲ Ξενοκλῆϲ νίκαϲα ¦ Εὐθύφρονοϲ υἱόϲ, | ἀπτῆϲ μōνο¦πάλαν[202] τέϲαρα ϲώμαθ' ἑλών, epigram on the base of a statue in Olympia by Polyclitus (ca. 400 BC, Erbert, *Griechische Epigramme*, n° 32, pp. 109/10; cf. Paus.6.9.2); τίμαϲον δὲ Φίλιππον, ὃϲ ἐνθάδε τοὺϲ ἀπὸ νάϲων | τέϲϲαραϲ εὐθείαι παῖδαϲ ἔκλινε μάχαι, Olympia, ca. 300 B.C., Ebert 55.5/6, pp. 166-9. The combat sport tournaments in the games were organized in keeping with a knock-out system: only the winner of a fight went on to the next round. If the number of competitors in a round turned out to be odd, one of them got a 'bye'; he was called ἔφεδροϲ; for more details on ἐφεδρεύειν see Lucian.*Herm*.40ff., who calls it οὐ μικρὰ εὐτυχία. Athletes prided themselves on having won the tournament ἀνέφεδροϲ. Cf. ἐϲτέφθη ἀνέφεδροϲ 'Ολύμπια παγκρατίωι παῖϲ, Ebert 76 A 7, pp. 225-9 (Olympia 49 AD); οὐ γὰρ ἐν εὐτυχίηι κλήρου ϲτέφοϲ, ἀλλ' ἐφεδρείηϲ | χωρίϲ, *ibid.* B 5/6. It is reasonable to assume that there were rules to prevent that one and the same athlete became ἔφεδροϲ twice in the same tournament (for more details see Ebert, pp. 228/9; Gardiner, *JHS* 25, 1905, 18-22). If an athlete won the tournament

---

[202] "'Spezialringen,' so genannt im Gegensatz offenbar zu jenem Ringkampf, der im Rahmen des Pentathlon stattfand," Ebert, p. 109.

by beating four successive opponents, the total number of competitors was thirty-one at most and nine at least. The prominence of the number four in these contexts gives rise to the suspicion that its mentioning had an encomistic purpose. Probably, explicit reference to having beaten four opponents is equivalent to the proud claim that the victor had won ἀνέφεδρος. This presupposes that the tournaments as a rule consisted of four rounds, which entails a maximum of sixteen competitors.

Aristarchus was the first to notice that in Homer the noun **cῶμα** is used exclusively for dead bodies.[203] In Pindar the noun may refer to dead as well as to living bodies.

For cῶμα referring to corpses, cf. Ἰcμηνοῦ δ' ἐπ' ὄχθαιcιγλυκὺν | νόcτον ἐρειcάμενοι λευκανθέα cώμαcι πίαναν καπνόν· | ἑπτὰ γὰρ δαίcαντο πυραὶ νεογυίοιc φῶταc, *N.*9.22-4; οὐδ' Ἀΐδαc ἀκινήταν ἔχε ῥάβδον, | βρότεα cώματ' ᾇ κατάγει κοίλαν πρὸc ἄγυιαν | θναιcκόντων, *O.*9.33-5. The noun is used to refer to the dead bodies of oxen in δοιὰ βοῶν | θερμὰ πρὸc ἀνθρακιὰν | cτρέψαν, πυρὶ δ' ὤπτων | cώματα, *fr.*168b.1-4. Cf. also *N.*3.47. In some cases cῶμα is used to refer to a living body in a context of death, cf. ἀθάναται δὲ βροτοῖc ἀμέραι, cῶμα δ' ἐcτὶ θνατόν, *fr.*94a.14/5; cῶμα μὲν πάντων ἕπεται θανάτωι περιcθενεῖ, | ζωὸν δ' ἔτι λείπεται αἰῶνοc εἴδωλον, *fr.*131b.1/2. When the noun is used to refer to a living human being, he is for obvious reasons very deliberately presented as a 'mere body.' In ἴων ξανθαῖcι καὶ παμπορφύροιc ἀκτῖcι βεβρεγμένοc ἁβρὸν | cῶμα, *O.*6.55/6, the noun refers to a five days old baby. For cώματα referring to the victor's opponents, cf. τοιῶ[ιδ' ὑπερθ]ύμωι c[θένε]ι | γυια[λκέα cώ]ματα [πρὸc γ]αίαι πελάccα[c, B.9.37/8; τέcαρα cώμαθ' ἑλών, Ebert 32 (cited above); cf. also γυίοιc, *O.*8.67. "Il termine sembra avere un valore dispregiativo," Giannini *ad h.l.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 583). Outside Homer and Pindar the situation is less clear. For δρῶντα γάρ νιν, ὦ γύναι, κακῶc | εἴληφα τοὐμὸν cῶμα cὺν τέχνηι κακῆι, S.*OT* 642/3, Jebb is probaly right that "it is a heated way of saying that Creon's supposed plot touched the *person* of the king ..., and not merely the νόμοι πόλεωc." For οὐκ ἦcθ' ἄρ' ὀρθῶc τοῦδε cώματοc πατήρ; E.*Alc.*636, the connotations of cῶμα are unclear.

Here the noun presents the victor's opponents as mere bodies, lacking any individual personality, so as to form a strong contrast with the victor himself, whose name will be on everyone's lips. Moreover, they are presented as victims, as to parallel the usual practice on the battlefields, where victims are indeed corpses. Thus the choice of the noun helps to emphasize Aristomenes' fierce aggression and undisputable superiority.

The verb **ἐμπίπτω** is quite common in the sense of 'attacking' enemies on the battlefield. Cf. βαρὺ δέ cφιν | νεῖκοc Ἀχιλεὺc | ἔμπεcε χαμαὶ

[203] See also Snell, *Discovery of the Mind*, p. 5.

καταβαὶϲ ἀφ' ἁρμάτων, φαεννᾶϲ υἱὸν εὖτ' ἐνάριξεν Ἀόοϲ ἀκμᾶι | ἔγχεοϲ ζακότοιο, *N.*6.50-3; ἐν δ' ἔπεϲον προμάχοιϲ Ὀδυϲεὺϲ καὶ φαίδιμοϲ υἱόϲ, *Od.*24.526; *Il.*1.68, etc. **ὑψόθεν** adds graphic detail to ἔμπετεϲ. It conjures up the image of the victor soaring down savagely from a superior position upon his opponents who humbly shrink back on the ground. They did not stand any chance in the first place. Pindar frequently uses words denoting 'height' is order to visualize superiority (see my note on line 77 above, p. 575). Moreover, ὑψόθεν resumes the image of ὕπερθε in 77, where the image, drawn from wrestling, refers to the superior position of someone benefited by divine favouring. This conveys the suggestion that the victor's superiority over his opponents is a manifestation of the divine elevation as described in the generic passage in 77. For the phrase cf. τοῦ δ' ὑψόθεν ἐξεριπόντοϲ, Hes.*Th.*704; καθύπερθεν ἐπεϲϲύμενοϲ, Q.S.4.253; see also Poliakoff, *Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*, pp. 106-8.

The phrase **κακὰ φρονέων**, 'meaning harm,' has a Homeric ring. Cf. Πάτροκλοϲ δὲ Τρωϲὶ κακὰ φρονέων ἐνόρουϲεν, *Il.*16.783; 7.70, 10.486, 12.67, 16.373, 22.264, 320, *Od.*17.596, 10.317. The phrase evokes connotations of a warrior attacking his enemies on the battlefield. For the construction cf. also πιϲτὰ φρονέων, *O.*3.17; μαλακὰ φρονέων ἐϲλοῖϲ, | τραχὺϲ δὲ παλιγκότοιϲ ἔφεδροϲ, *N.*4.95/6; ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοῖα φρονεῖ, *fr.*43.5.

83-84. τοῖϲ οὔτε νόϲτοϲ ὁμῶϲ | ἔπαλπνοϲ ἐν Πυθιάδι κρίθη

For the losers, the κρίϲιϲ of the Pythian wrestling contest, the 'adjudging of the prize', i.e. 'outcome' was a home-coming that was not as pleasant as for the victor. τοῖϲ, refers to ϲωμάτεϲϲι, viz. the victor's beaten opponents; the are the *topic* of the following passage (83-7). ὁμῶϲ, 'in the like manner,' *sc.* ϲοί, 'with you': 'not as pleasant a home-coming as yours' is an evocative understatement that poignantly stresses the contrast between the victor and the losers.

ἔπαλπνοϲ is a hapax. The scholiast paraphrases: ἡ ἀνακομιδὴ οὔτε ἡδεῖα οὔτε προϲηνὴϲ ἐγένετο, 119 (II 217 Dr.). Of the simplex *ἄλπνοϲ only the superlative occurs and only once: δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶϲ ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιϲτον εὐανθεῖ ϲὺν ὄλβωι, | εἴ τιϲ εὖ πάϲχων λόγον ἐϲλὸν ἀκούηι, *I.*5.12/3 (the mss. have ἀνέλπιϲτον, which does not scan; the correction was made by Callierges and Wackernagel, and is confirmed to be an ancient vario lectio by the scholiast: γράφουϲι δὲ ἔνιοι τὸν ἄλπνιϲτον, τουτέϲτι τὸν ἥδιϲτον καὶ προϲηνέϲτατον, 14a, III 243 Dr.). Hesychius has an entry ἀλπαλαῖον· ἀγαπητόν, where Is. Vossius read ἀλπναῖον. Frisk *s.v.* observes: "ἀλπ- aus *ϝαλπ- gilt als Schwundstufe von *ϝελπ- in ἔλπομαι, ἐλπίϲ"; Lat. *volup-*.

For **νόcτοc** referring to the athlete's home-coming cf. ἀνορέαc δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακὼν | ἐν τέτραcιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοιc | νόcτον ἔχθιcτον καὶ ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶccαν καὶ ἐπίκρυφον οἶμον, *O*.8.67-9; τόν, ὦ πολῖται, κωμάξατε Τιμοδήμωι cὺν εὐκλεῒ νόcτωι, *N*.2.24. The notion of the victor's νόcτοc has been central to a number of studies on Pindar's poetry from a anthropological point of view (see introduction, pp. 11/2). See in particular Crotty, *Song and Action*, ch. 4, and Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, ch. 1 & 2; further references are to be found therein. Both Crotty and Kurke point at the cyclial nature athlete's journey, out to where the danger is and κλέοc is to be won and back home where one can pick the fruits of one's κλέοc ('the loop of νόcτοc,' Kurke). The *Odyssey* naturally is a central text in this connection. They take it to be one of the primary functions of the victory ode to secure the successful return home of the victor from the games and his re-integration into his own society. Although one may be sceptical about the latter claim, Crotty and Kurke are certainly right in drawing attention to the fact that νόcτοc is charged with epic connotations. In our passage the noun helps to associate athletic competition with war, which has the effect of emphasizing Aristomenes' fierce and aggressive side.

The idea of the athletic contest having been brought to a decision underlies the choice of the verb **κρίθη**. For the losers, the κρίcιc, the 'adjudging of the prize,' i.e., the 'outcome' of the contest was a home-coming that was not as pleasant as for the victor.

For κρίνειν τινί τι, 'adjudge' something to someone, cf. εἰ ζῶν Ἀχιλλεὺc τῶν ὅπλων τῶν ὧν πέρι | κρίνειν ἔμελλε κράτοc ἀριcτείαc τινί, οὐκ ἄν τιc αὔτ' ἔμαρψεν ἄλλοc ἀντ' ἐμοῦ, S.*Aj*.442-4; in the passive: τιμαὶ δὲ βροτοῖcι κεκριμέναι, *fr*.94a.6/7; with the dative understood: ἓν ἀνδρῶν, ἓν θεῶν γένοc· ἐκ μιᾶc δὲ πνέομεν | ματρὸc ἀμφότεροι· διείργει δὲ πᾶcα κεκριμένα | δύναμιc, ὡc τὸ μὲν οὐδέν, ὁ δὲ χάλκεοc ἀcφαλὲc αἰὲν ἕδοc μένει οὐρανόc, *N*.6.1-4; cf. also ἤτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται πεῖραc οὔ τι θανάτου, *O*.2.31, where the adnominal genitive performs the function of the dative, as in: κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμοναc ἀνδρῶν, *I*.5.11. For the verb in an agonistic context cf. κρίνειν τα[χυτᾶτά τε] λαιψηρῶν ποδῶν | Ἕλλαcι καὶ γυ[ίων ἀ]ριcταλκὲc cθένοc, B.7.6/7; ἀγῶνα τόνδε κρίνειν μουcικώτατα, Ar.*Ra*.873; cf. also *N*.5.40/1 with my note (pp. 167/8). In ἄριcτοc εὐφροcύνα πόνων κεκριμένων | ἰατρόc, *N*.4.1/2, the verb is in keeping with the terminology of both the *vehicle* and the *tenor:* on the level of the *vehicle* it refers to illnesses that have 'passed the crisis'[204]; on the level of the *tenor* to athletic efforts that have been brought to a favourable decision. The idea of the athletic contest having been brought to a decision underlies the choice of the verb also in cὺν δὲ τὶν | καὶ

---

[204] See Slater *s.v.* (p. 290), citing Van Brock, *Le vocabulaire médical*, Paris 1961, 214.

παῖϲ ὁ Θεαρίωνοϲ ἀρετᾷ κριθεὶϲ | εὔδοξοϲ ἀείδεται Cωγένηϲ μετὰ πενταέθλοιϲ, *N.*7.6-8, where ἀρετᾷ κριθεὶϲ εὔδοξοϲ is a comprimated way of saying 'by means of his ἀρετά he brought the contest to a for him favourable decision, by which he proved himself εὔδοξοϲ.' For the noun κρίϲιϲ of the decision of an athletic contest cf. *O.*3.21, *O.*7.80, *P.*4.253, *N.*10.23. See also Bernardini, *Mito*, p. 96 with n. 4.

85-86. οὐδὲ μολόντων πὰρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλωϲ γλυκὺϲ | ὦρϲεν χάριν 'Nor, when they returned to their mothers, did sweet laughter rouse joy all around.' This sentence, together with the next (86/7), elaborates upon the unpleasant home-coming of the defeated contestants. Again (like οὔτε νόϲτοϲ ὁμῶϲ | ἔπαλπνοϲ in the preceding lines), the description is in the negative, denying to the losers the pleasures that the victor has got. This stresses the contrast. For χάριϲ of the 'joy' of victory cf. *O.*7.5, *O.*10.78/9, *I.*6.50; see further my note on *N.*5.54 (p. 193).

ἀμφί is an adverb (cf. *P.*4.81, *P.*9.120; cf. also *Il.*10.535). μολόντων πὰρ ματέρ' is a genitive absolute. The defeated contestants (referred to by τοῖϲ in 83) are to be supplied as the subject. For a genitive absolute with implied subject see my note on line 43 above (pp. 530/1). On the level of structuring the discourse, in resuming the notion νόϲτοϲ in the preceding sentence, the phrase provides the audience with an orientation as to the setting of the description that is to follow (85-7). On this level, πὰρ ματέρ' serves to specify that the direction of μολόντων is home. But, more importantly, it is a highly evocative detail which conjures up the scene of the home-coming with vivid directness.

Theoretically, μολόντων πὰρ ματέρ' can be interpreteted as governed by γέλωϲ. This makes a slight difference in sense. Then, put in the positive, it is the laughter of the home-coming athlete that rouses joy on the part of those waiting for him to return; one could perhaps imagine the picture of the returning athlete approaching and those waiting for him trying to make out whether or not he has won from the look on his face. But this borders on the artificial. Moreover, this interpretation is less likely in the light of the information structure of the passage: the pragmatic function of the phrase is not to identify the *agens* of the act of laughing implied in γέλωϲ (then the sentence initial position would be odd, as well as the seperation from the governing noun[205]), but to provide the setting of the scene.

---

[205] The whole passage about the misery of the defeated contestants is characterized by an evocative directness, which is reflected by straightforward syntax presenting clear-cut information units in a natural linear succession (contrast passages like 25-7, 39/40).

For an unspecified mother conjuring up the idea of home cf. μή τινα λειπόμενον | τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰῶνα πέσσοντ', ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ θανάτωι | φάρμακον κάλλιστον ἑᾶς ἀρετᾶς ἅλιξιν εὑρέσθαι σὺν ἄλλοις, *P.*4.185-7; ὡς δ' ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι φῶτες ἄγαγον, κτλ., *O.*1.46. See further my note on *N.*5.6 (pp. 105/6). Kirkwood *ad loc.* (p. 201) suggests that πὰρ ματέρ' derives its relevance from the fact that the victor, and thus also his opponents, were boy wrestlers (cf. ὦ παῖ, 33; thus also Giannini *ad loc.* in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 584). The fact that in *P.*4.186 a similar expression is used in connection with the Argonauts makes it unlikely that the phrase in itself evokes connotations with youth.

For **οὔτε ... οὐδέ**, "giving the effect of climax in the second limb ('neither ... nor yet ...')" (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 193), cf. S.*OC* 1141; μήτε ... μηδέ, *I.*2.44/5. Cf. also τε ... οὐ ... οὐδέ in lines 36/7 above with my note (pp. 520/1).

86-87. κατὰ λαύρας δ' ἐχθρῶν ἀπάοροι | πτώσσοντι

'Down narrow alleys, out of their enemies way, they shrink back.' The defeated contestants hide away from people, trying to become invisible, in order not to grant their enemies the pleasure of ridiculing their dishonour. Cf. θανοῦσα θήσω τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐχθροῖς γέλων, E.*Med.*383.

The **λαῦραι** (the noun occurs only here in Pindar) are 'backstreets,' which one takes in order to avoid meeting people (cf. ἐπίκροφον οἶμον, *O.*8.69),[206] as opposed to the broad avenues which the triumphant victor would walk through, like the εὐρυχόρους ἀγυιάς (55) by which the victorious army of the Epigonoi went through Argos.

In *Od.*22.128, 137, the λαύρη probably denotes a corridor, running behind one of the side-walls of the megaron, which provided an alternative access from the central court to the megaron, in addition to the main entrance (see J.L. Myres, 'On the Plan of the Homeric House', *JHS* 20, 1900, 128-50; D. Gray, 'Houses in the Odyssee', *CQ* 1955, 1-12, with app.); the scholia on these passages paraphrase λαύρα as στενὴ ὁδός (cf. Hesych. *s.v.* λαύρη). In κατὰ δὴ ὦν ἑκάστην ὁδὸν ἐν τῆι αἱμασιῆι τῆι παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν πυλίδες ἐπῆσαν, ὅσαι περ αἱ λαῦραι, τοσαῦται ἀριθμόν, Hdt.1.180, in the description of Babylon, the noun refers to the alleys leading off the main streets to the river; cf. also Hermesian.7.65 (Powell, *Coll. Alex.* pp. 96 ff.), Herod.1.13. The same noun is sometimes used to refer to sewers (Hippon. in *PSI* 9.1089.10, Ar.*Pax.*99, 158, J.*AJ.*15.9.6); the scholiast on Ar.*Pax.*99 explains: λαύρας ἐκάλουν τὰς στενὰς ῥύμας ἔνθα πᾶσα ἀκαθαρία ἐστίν, ἢ τοὺς ῥυπαροὺς τόπους.

The adjective **ἀπάορος**, 'far from, out of reach of' (ἀφωρισμένοι, κεχωρισμένοι, Σ.124a, II 217 Dr.), is paralleled only by: δύο ... | ἀστέρες, οὔτε τι πολλὸν ἀπήοροι οὔτε μάλ' ἐγγύς, Arat.396, 895 (οὗτοι δέ, φησίν, οὔτε πολὺ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων διεστήκασι, οὔτ' ἐπὶ πολὺ ψαύουσι ἀλλήλων, Σ.*ad loc.*, p.

[206] Cf. also Apul.*Met.*3.10 (cit. Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 215 n. 19).

264 ed. Martin). For the antonym, ϲυνάοροϲ, cf. εὐλογία φόρμιγγι ϲυνάοροϲ, *N.*4.5; ἀλλὰ θαυμάζω, τί με λέξοντι Ἰϲθμοῦ I δεϲπόται τοιάνδε μελίφρονοϲ ἀρχὰν εὑρόμενον ϲκολίου I ξυνάορον ξυναῖϲ γυναιξίν, *fr.*122.13-5; cf. also γλυκεῖά οἱ καρδίαν I ἀτάλλοιϲα γηροτρόφοϲ ϲυναορεῖ I Ἐλπίϲ, *fr.*214.1-3.

The verb **πτώϲϲω** (only here in Pindar, but cf. ἔπταξαν δ' ἀκίνητοι ϲιωπᾶι I ἥροεϲ ἀντίθεοι πυκινὰν μῆτιν κλύοντεϲ, *P.*4.57/8) denotes 'croutching'; cf. ὑμεῖϲ δ', ὦ γυμνῆτεϲ, ὑπ' ἀϲπίδοϲ ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοϲ I πτώϲϲοντεϲ μεγάλοιϲ βάλλετε χερμαδίοιϲ, Tyrt.11.35/6. It is frequently used metaphorically in the sense of 'shrinking back' from fear, as in: τί πτώϲϲειϲ, τί δ' ὀπιτεύειϲ πολέμοιο γεφύραϲ; *Il.*4.371; πτώϲϲονταϲ ὑφ' Ἕκτορι πάνταϲ, *Il.*7.129; cf. 5.634. Often of 'fleeing' from fear: ἀκρίδεϲ ... φευγέμεναι ποταμόνδε· τὸ δὲ φλέγει ἀκάματον πῦρ I ὄρμενον ἐξαίφνηϲ, ταὶ δὲ πτώϲϲουϲι καθ' ὕδωρ, *Il.*21.12-4; cf. *ibid.*25/6, E.*Ba.*223.

After three aorists (ἔμπετεϲ, 81; κρίθη, 84; ὦρϲεν, 86), the passage describing the misfortune of the defeated contestants is rounded off by a sentence with the finite verb in the present. These tenses reflect the temporal perspective of the moment of the ode's first performance: the contest was in the past, it was decided in the past, and the homecoming of the victor and of his defeated opponents had taken place in the past; the present πτώϲϲοντι conveys the suggestion that the situation of the losers shrinking back in alleys is still existing on the moment of the celebrations for the victor. This emphasizes the contrast.

87. ϲυμφορᾶι δεδαγμένοι

'Bitten by their misfortune.' The mss. read δεδαϊγμένοι, which gives good sense (for δαΐζω cf. *P.*6.33; for the metaphorical sense cf. *Od.*13.320; *Il.*17.53), but gives irregular responsion.[207] Bergk's correction δεδαγμένοι is confirmed by the scholiast, who paraphrases τῆι τῆϲ ἥττηϲ ϲυμφορᾶι δακνόμενοι (124b, II 217 Dr.). For the metaphorical usage of this verb cf. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τᾶϲ (*sc.* Ἀφροδίταϲ) ἕκατι κηρὸϲ ὣϲ δαχθεὶϲ ἕλαι I ἱρᾶν μελιϲϲᾶν τάκομαι, *fr.*123.10/1; μάλιϲτα δ' ἥδε ϲυμφορὰ δάκνει, A.*Pers.*846; cf. also ἐμὲ δὲ χρέων I φεύγειν δάκοϲ ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν, *P.*2.51/2. The perfect underscores the present relevance of the situation 'bitten by misfortune' for the defeated contestants. Although the situation had been initiated on a moment in the past (viz. the moment of their defeat), the perfect makes clear that the defeated contestants *now* feel 'bitten by their misfortune.' Thus the perfect presents the defeat as a dishonour that stains the defeated for ever.

---

[207] Hermann's δεδαιγμένοι cannot be correct because the verb δαΐζω *always* occurs with diaresis.

συμφορά is a *vox media*, denoting 'concurrence' of circumstances, 'juncture' (cf. αἱ συμφοραὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄρχουσι, καὶ οὐκὶ ἄνθρωποι τῶν συμφορῶν, Hdt.7.49; συμφοραὶ βίου, A.*Eu.*1020, S.*OT* 33, etc.). The context may specify it as positive or negative, 'good fortune' (cf. συμφοραὶ ἐσθλαί, E.*Alc.*1155; χορῶν κατάστασιν | πολλῶν ἐν Ἄργει, τῆσδε συμφορᾶς χάριν, A.*Ag.*24, etc.), or 'misfortune' (συμφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς, *O.*7.77; αἱ παροῦσαι συμφοραί, S.*Ph.*885, etc.).

ANTISTROPHE E

88-92

He whom in times of great prosperity is granted a new delight flies away from hope on the wings of his manliness, having a stronger ambition than riches.

The train of thought is as follows. Wealth gives someone the opportunity to accomplish great achievements. Therefore wealth is a ground for high hopes. If a man succeeds in employing his material goods for achieving something great (e.g., a victory in one of the Great Games), he wins a new delight to crown the wealth he has got already. Then he passes from the stage of hoping into the stage in which his hopes have been realised, 'flying away from hope,' winged on his capacities. Moreover, his name 'flies' from mouth to mouth, for his ἀνορέαι have earned him κλέος. And the reason why he has won κλέος is that his ambitions surpass the mere accumulation of material riches. For, if one is blessed with prosperity in combination with ἀνορέαι, there are two options: one can either strive at amplifying one's riches or use one's prosperity in order to accomplish a higher goal, such as a victory in the Great Games. Only the latter option results in κλέος.

The same nexus of ideas occurs elsewhere in Pindar. It is instructive to compare: εἰ δέ μοι πλοῦτον θεὸς ἁβρὸν ὀρέξαι, | ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὑρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω, *P.*3.110/1 (a generalized first person),[208] where πλοῦτος ἁβρός is a ground for hope for κλέος. Cf. also ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν | καιρόν, *O.*2.53/4. τιμά (won at war) is the πλούτου στεφάνωμ' ἀγέρωχον, *P.*1.50. The wrong thing to do is to store one's riches away instead of using them in order to win κλέος: οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν μεγάρωι πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν, | ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων. κοιναὶ γὰρ ἔρχοντ' ἐλπίδες | πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν, *N.*1.31-3 (a generalized first person), cf. *I.*5.12/3. An unbridled persuit of material 'profit' for its own sake does not result in κλέος: μὴ δολωθῇς, ὦ

[208] On the 'first-person indefinite', see Young, *Three Odes*, pp. 58-61.

φίλε, κέρδεσιν ἐντραπέλοις· ὀπιθόμβροτον αὔχημα δόξας | οἶον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει | καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς, *P.*1.92-4; cf. *N.*7.15-20. In *P.*11.56-8, a good name is said to be the best of possessions. See further Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, pp. 225-9.

The idea is elaborated in detail in *I.*1. Lines 41-51 of that ode define the proper function of wealth for a noble: he must invest expenditure and toil in order to acquire κλέος (41-6). Every man works for μισθός (47-9), but the 'wage, profit' that a noble must work for is not material: ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἁβρόν, | εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον, 50/1, a good repute, won by means of excelling in war or in the games, that is the proper 'profit' for a noble. "The use of imagery drawn from the sphere of disembedded economics (particularly μισθός and κέρδος) ... is directed at the poet's audience: it takes up their concern with profit in order ot convince them that the 'highest profit' is to be praised by citizens and strangers," Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, p. 238. At the very end of the ode the negative alternative is given: εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον, | ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾶι, ψυχὰν 'Αΐδαι τελέων οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἄνευθεν, 67/8: not to invest one's wealth in public display of one's excellence means consigning oneself to eternal invisibility.

This emphasis upon material prosperity as an tool for winning immaterial rewards touches upon the core of aristocratic ideology (the embedded economy). Pindar represents his aristocratic commissioners and defends their ideology and their way of life, which was increasingly challenged by the rise of the money (i.e., disembedded) economy. Rather than to intepret those passages in which Pindar acts as an advocate of the old aristocratic ideals as aiming at "convincing a sometimes recalcitrant aristocracy to continue its visible expenditure within the civic sphere,"[209] it is more plausible to interpret them as directed against those elements in his audience (i.e., against those elements in in his commissioner's society), who were opposing the old ideals. See further interpretation, pp. 448-51.

88. ὁ δὲ καλόν τι νέον λάχων

The new *topic* is he whom is granted a new καλόν. The fortune of such a man forms a sharp contrast to the misery of the defeated contestants. The formulation is generic (cf. τι), but the preceding description of the misfortune of the defeated contestants suggests Aristomenes as an example of such a man, his victory being the new καλόν (cf. 33 above with my note, p. 517). For λαγχάνω cf. my note

[209] Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*, p. 228.

on *N.*3.31 (pp. 312-4). On the fuction of the echo of line 33 see my note on 90/1 below.

89. ἁβρότατος ἔπι μεγάλας

'At times of great prosperity.' This does not refer to the moment of the victory ("at the moment of success," Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 213), but to the general condition for hoping for success: 'in a position of affluence necessary for far-reaching athletic ambitions' (Farnell *ad loc.*, p. 199). See above. μεγάλας could go with ἁβρότατος or with ἐλπίδος. There is no formal reason why any one construction should be excluded.[210] The adjective is not equally indispensible for both nouns, which makes an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction[211] implausible. In such a situation it is best to take the adjective with the first noun[212] because this interpretation is most likely to concur with how a listening audience would take it: on hearing μεγάλας they would naturally construe it with ἐλπίδος, an excellent candidate and the only one available at that point; ἐλπίδος then would theoretically be another candidate, but since this noun can perfectly well stand unspecified there is nothing that leads the hearer to re-assess his previous interpretation.

ἁβρότας denotes 'prosperity.'[213] Cf. ἐπεὶ ἀμφ' Ἑλέναι πυρωθέντας | Τρώων ἔλυσε δόμους ἁβρότατος, *P.*11.33/4; ἁβρότητι ξυνέασιν Ἴωνες βασιλῆες, B.*fr.*26. Cf. also my note on ἁβρά, *N.*5.26 (p. 146). Any negative connotations of 'excessive luxury' which are not uncommon in later Greek (E.*Ba.*968, *IA* 1343, Pl.*Alc.*1.122c, X.*Cyr.*8.8.15, etc.) are absent in Pindar.

For **ἐπί** 'at the time of,' cf. ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνδρῶν, *O.*7.72, cf. *Il.*5.637, 23.332; ἐπ' εἰρήνης, *Il.*2.797, 9.403; ἐπ' ἐμῆς νεότητος, Ar.*Ach.*211, etc. Alternatively, the preposition may be taken to refer to the circumstance, as in ἐπ' ἐξουσίας καὶ πλούτου πονηρὸν εἶναι, D.21.138.

90. ἐξ ἐλπίδος

The phrase ἐξ ἐλπίδος does not mean that the hope is the cause of the flight ('soars by reason of his hope,' Gildersleeve *ad loc.*; 'hoffnungsbeflügelt,' Schroeder *ad loc.*; 'driven by hope,' H. Fränkel,

---

[210] Farnell *ad loc.* (p. 198).

[211] Slater *s.v.* μέγας a β (p. 317). On ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in general see Des Places, *REG* 75, 1962, 1-12.

[212] Thus Σ.126b (II 218 Dr.), Gildersleeve, *ad loc.* (p. 333); Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 75); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 190; Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 584). For a different opinion see Hermann.

[213] ἁβρότας does not refer to the freshness and delicacy of youth, as LSJ *s.v.* have it. See also Farnell *ad loc.* (pp. 199/200); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 190; Gentili, *Pitiche*, p. 214 n. 1.

TAPhA 77, 1946, 133),[214] but its starting-point; the flight, i.e. κλέος, is the τέλος (cf. *N.*8.45, *O.*13.104) of the ἐλπίς: someone who flies ἐξ ἐλπίδος leaves behind the stage of 'expecting,' i.e., his expectations are either realized (as *h.l.*) or frustrated by reality.[215] Cf. εὔχομαι δ' ἐξ ἐμᾶς ἐλπίδος ψύθη πεσεῖν | ἐς τὸ μὴ τελεσφόρον, A.*Ag.*998/9; ὑπόπτερος δ' ὁ πλοῦτος· οἷς γὰρ ἦν ποτε, | ἐξ ἐλπίδων πίπτοντας ὑπτίους ὁρῶ, E.*fr.*420.4/5 N.

Cf. also ὁ δ' ἐλπίδας ἐξ ἐλπίδων ἀεὶ κυλίνδων, καὶ ταῖς μὲν εὐτυχίαις ἐπ' ἄλλας χρώμενος ἀφορμαῖς, Plu.*Pyrrh.*30.3, where the clause introduced by καί makes clear that for Pyrrhus the favourable outcome of some expectations served as a basis for further expectations; νομιστέον οὐχ ὃς ἂν ὑμῖν ἢ μηδὲν ἢ μικρὰ προστάττῃ, τοῦτον ὀρθῶς λέγειν· ὁρᾶτε γὰρ ὡς ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἐλπίδων καὶ λόγων εἰς πᾶν προελήλυθε μοχθηρίας τὰ παρόντα, D.*Prooem.*1.3. Cf. also expressions like οὐκ εἰδότα εἴ σε πλησίον ἤδη τοῦ ἄκρου γενόμενον τὸ χρεὼν ἐπιστὰν κατασπάσει λαβόμενον τοῦ ποδὸς ἐξ ἀτελοῦς τῆς ἐλπίδος, Lucian.*Hermotim.*6; ἄκων μὲν δὴ Κάσσιος Αἴγυπτον ἐκ τῶν ἐλπίδων μεθίει, App.*BC* 4.8.63, etc. Thus also with ἀπό, cf. ἀπ' ἐλπίδος με καταλαβὼν μεγάλης ἀπέρχῃ ἣν εἶχον, ὡς παρὰ σοῦ μαθὼν κτλ., Pl.*Euthyph.*15e; ἀπὸ δὴ θαυμαστῆς ἐλπίδος, ὦ ἑταῖρε, ᾠχόμην φερόμενος, Pl.*Phaed.*97b; ἀθυμῶ δ' εἰ φανήσομαι τάχα | κακὸν μέγ' ἐκπράξας' ἀπ' ἐλπίδος καλῆς, S.*Trach.*666/7, etc.

Here ἐλπίς is the hope for κλέος, fed by 'great prosperity' (89), as in: εἰ δέ μοι πλοῦτον θεὸς ἁβρὸν ὀρέξαι, | ἐλπίδ' ἔχω κλέος εὑρέσθαι κεν ὑψηλὸν πρόσω, *P.*3.110/1 (a generalized first person), where πλοῦτος ἁβρός is a ground for hope for κλέος (cf. also *O.*2.53/4, cited above). The achievement of a 'new καλόν' (88), e.g., a victory won in one of the Great Games, means the realization of this hope, since then one has acquired κλέος: one's name flies from mouth to mouth (90).

ἐλπίς denotes 'expectation.' The context may specify whether this is an expectation is for something desirable, 'hope,' or for something undesirable, 'fear.' Cf. δόξας μελλόντων, οἷν κοινὸν μὲν ὄνομα ἐλπίς, ἴδιον δέ, φόβος μὲν ἡ πρὸ λύπης ἐλπίς, θάρρος δὲ ἡ πρὸ ἐναντίου, Pl.*Lg.*644c; αἵ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν | πόλλ' ἄνω, τὰ δ' αὖ κάτω | ψεύδη μεταμώνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ' ἐλπίδες· | σύμβολον δ' οὔ πώ τις ἐπιχθονίων | πιστὸν ἀμφὶ πράξιος ἐσσομένας εὗρεν θεόθεν, | τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί, *O.*12.5-9; τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ φόβου ὁμοίαν ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς ἔχουσιν, Th.7.61; οὔ μοι φόβου μέλανθρον ἐλπὶς ἐμπατεῖ, A.*Ag.*1434. For a one-sided positive use cf. *P.*3.111, *P.*4.201, etc. For a one-sided use in *malam partem* cf., e.g., ὡς | δυσμενοῦς

[214] Thus also Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 584): "la preposizione ἐξ indica la causa efficiente (cf. Slater *s.v.*, p. 159) e il verbo πέταται acquista un senso quasi passivo, come se fosse 'viene levato in volo'." Giannini compares πέτομαι δ' ἐλπίσιν, S.*OT* 487; ἐλπίσιν ἀθανάταις ... φέρονται, *fr.*10; but the fact that there we have the dative rather than ἐκ makes all the difference.

[215] Cf. the scholiast: ἐκ τῶν εὐτυχηθεισῶν ἐλπίδων ὑψοῦται, 126b, II 218 Dr.

ὑπερτέρου | ἐλπὶς ἐστι νύκτερον τέλος μολεῖν, | παγκλαύτων ἀλγέων ἐπίρροθον, A.*Th.*365-8; οἴμοι· προσῆλθεν ἐλπίς, ἣν φοβουμένη | πάλαι τὸ μέλλον ἐξετηκόμην γόοις, E.*Or.*859/60. On ἐλπίς see further: F. Wehrli, *ΛΑΘΕ ΒΙΩΣΑΣ. Studien zur ältesten Ethik bei den Griechen*, Leipzig & Berlin 1931, 6-10; O. Lachnit, *Elpis*, Tübingen 1965; J.J.A. Schrijen, *Elpis*, Groningen 1965; J.L. Myres, ''Ἐλπίς, ἔλπω, ἔλπομαι ἐλπίζειν', *CR* 63, 1949, 46; Fränkel, *Wege und Formen*, p. 26 n. 1.

90-91. πέταται | ὑποπτέροις ἀνορέαις

'He flies on the wings of his manliness.' His excellence has earned him κλέος: he flies from mouth to mouth (for the victor being airborne, cf. πολλὰ δὲ πρόσθεν πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν, *P.*9.125; *N.*6.48/9, Thgn.237-9; cf. also *Il.*19.384-6; see further my note on line 33 above, pp. 517/8). Lines 88-91 (καλόν τι νέον, πέταται) echo 33/4 (νεώτατον καλῶν, ποτανόν). In 33/4 the poet exhorts himself that the victor's νεώτατον καλῶν must go (ἴτω) 'winged' (ποτανόν) by his skills. Now, near the end of the ode, the victor is actually 'flying.' This sophisticated technique of ring-compostion has a close parallel in *N.*3, where in 6/7 victory 'thirsts for' song; in 76-9, near the end of the ode, a song-drink is indeed presented to the victor. The qualifications of the two words denoting flight, ἐμᾶι ... ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶι (34) and ὑποπτέροις ἀνορέαις (91) mirror one another. Pindar elegantly connects the need for 'flying' with his own skills and the fulfillment of this need with the victor's own capacities. For ἀνορέα see my note on *N.*3.20 (p. 285).

91-92. ἔχων | κρέσσονα πλούτου μέριμναν

'Having a stronger ambition than riches.' The post-posed participle phrase specifies the attitude that is the condition for the sublimation of wealth to κλέος, as described in the preceding main clause (88-1), to occur. In the aristocratic frame of reference of Pindar's commissioners, obsession with wealth for its own sake is wrong, dangerous and corrupting (*P.*1.92, *P.*3.54, *P.*4.140, *N.*7.18, *N.*9.33, *N.*11.47; cf. lines 13-5 above). Wealth must serve higher goals: it must be used as a means to win κλέος, e.g., by winning a victory in one of the Great Games. Aristomenes is an example of someone who was led by the good old aristocratic ideals. See further my general note above on this passage as a whole (pp. 588/9). For the expression cf. κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας | ἄνδρες, *N.*9.32/3. For μέριμνα see my note on *N.*3.69 (p. 379). For κρέσσων, 'stronger,' in the sense of 'better, preferable' see my note on *N.*3.30 (pp. 310/1).

92-97

In a short time the pleasure of men is growing. Just so it also falls on the ground, ruined by a repellent attitude. Creatures of one day. What is someone? What is someone not? Of shadow a dream is man. But whenever god-given gleam comes, shining light attends men and a sweet life.

92-93. ἐν δ' ὀλίγωι βροτῶν | τὸ τερπνὸν αὔξεται

τὸ τερπνόν is quite frequently used by Pindar as a generic term for what is 'pleasant' (cf. *O*.8.53, 9.28, 10.93, 13.115, 14.5, *P*.10.19, *N*.7.74, *I*.7.40, *fr*.42.3, 131b.4). Here it includes success resulting in κλέος, as described in the preceding sentence; Aristomenes' glory and happiness because of his recent victory is in the present context the most obvious example of such a τερπνόν. For ἐν ὀλίγωι *sc*. χρόνωι (cf. *N*.7.38), cf. τὰ τῆς τύχης πολλὰ καὶ ἐν ὀλίγωι ξυμβάντα παρὰ λόγον, Th.4.55; Pl.*Ap*.22b, etc. τὸ τερπνόν is the *topic* of this and the following sentence. The appropriate place in the sentence for noun phrases that define a new *topic* is the sentence initial position, before (or surrounding) δέ. Here this position is taken by ἐν ὀλίγωι. The effect of this is that the rapidity changes of fortune is emphasized. For the quick changes of fate cf. εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου οὐ φαίνται· ἐκ δέ νιν τελευτάσει ἦ καὶ[216] σάμερον | δαίμων, *P*.12.28-30 (with my *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 410-2).

93. οὕτω δὲ καὶ πίτνει χαμαί

οὕτω *sc*. ἐν ὀλίγωι; καί underscores the parallelism. For the idea cf. ὡς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν | ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια, S.*Aj*.131/2. πίτνει χαμαί resumes the imagery of 90 (πέταται) and of 77 (ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων· ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν). If τὸ τερπνόν 'falls on the ground,' it is annihilated. χαμαί is, as referring to the lowest possible position, an image of inferiority and lack of success: cf. φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων | γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότωι κυλίνδει | χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν, *N*.4.39-41, where the dominant connotation is 'ineffectual,' as in: οὔτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψεαι, *O*.9.12; χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν, *P*.6.38. Cf. also ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλὸν | μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾶι καλύψαι, *N*.9.6/7.

94. ἀποτρόπωι γνώμαι σεσεισμένον

'Ruined by a repellent attitude.' The annihilation of τὸ τερπνόν is presented as caused by a wrong moral disposition, just like ἔχων |

---

[216] Bowra: ἤτοι codd.

κρέccονα πλούτου μέριμναν (91/2) defines the mental attitude required for success.[217]

γνώμα in Pindar denotes a mental disposition, 'attitude,' which determines one's intentions and purposes, often with a moral dimension. Cf. εὐcεβεῖ γνώμαι φυλάccοντες μακάρων τελέτας, *O.*3.41; πρὸς ἡcυχίαν φιλόπολιν καθαρᾶι γνώμαι τετραμμένον, *O.*4.16; χρή νιν εὑρόντεccιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον | μὴ φθονεραῖcι φέρειν | γνώμαις, *I.*1.43-5 (cf. *N.*4.40); μέτρα μὲν γνώμαι διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων, *I.*6.71, where γνώμαι applies the principle of heeding μέτρα to Lampon's moral attitude in general.[218] Sometimes, γνώμα is used with an intellectual instead of moral dimension. Cf. κυβερνατῆρος οἰακοςτρόφου | γνώμαι πεπιθὼν πολυβούλωι, *I.*4.72/3. The noun can also be used to refer to a concrete manifestation of a person's mental attitude: 'determination, purpose, intention, plan.' Cf. τάχα δ' εὐθὺς ἰὼν cφετέρας | ἐστάθη γνώμας ἀταρβάκτοιο πειρώμενος | ἐν ἀγορᾶι πλήθοντος ὄχλου, *P.*4.83-5; ὣς ἄρ' αὐδάcαντος οὐ γνώμαι διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν, *N.*10.89; Λοξίας, κοινᾶνι παρ' εὐθυτάτωι γνώμαν πιθών, | πάντα ἰcάντι νόωι, *P.*3.28/9; ἐλπίς, ἃ μάλιστα θνατῶν πολύcτροφον γνώμαν κυβερνᾶι, *fr.*124.3. In the specific phrase 'contrary to one's γνώμα' (παρὰ γνώμαν, ἔμπαλιν γνώμας) the connotation of anticipation has the preponderance: 'contrary to one's expectation.' Cf. πολλὰ δ' ἀνθρώποις παρὰ γνώμαν ἔπεcεν, *O.*12.10; ἀλλ' ἔcται χρόνος | οὗτος, ὃ καί τιν' ἀελπτίαι βαλὼν | ἔμπαλιν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώcει, τὸ δ' οὔπω, *P.*12.30-2.

The various usages of **ἀπότροπος** correspond with the various usages of the verb ἀποτρέπω. The adjective can be used in the sense of 'averting oneself', corresponding to the intransitive middle of the verb (τὸν ἀπότροπον ... Ἔρωτα, Bion *Idyll.*2.2), or 'turned away,' i.e. 'far from men' (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ παρ' ὕεccιν ἀπότροπος, *Od.*14.372). In an active sense the adjective means 'averting', in a positive sense (ἀποτρόποιcι δαίμοcιν | θέλουcα θῦcειν, A.*Pers.*203/4; χάριν ἀχάριτον ἀπότροπον κακῶν, A.*Ch.*44). In a negative sense, ἀπότροπος characterizes the notion it qualifies as something from which one turns away (ὅ τις ἂν ἀποτρέποιτο, Hsch.), i.e., 'repulsive' (ἀπότροπος ἄγος, A.*Ch.*155, τὸν ἀπότροπον ... Ἀΐδαν, S.*Aj.*608; cκότου νέφος ἀπότροπον,

---

[217] Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 585) takes γνώμαι to refer to the will of the gods, comparing Διὸς | γνώμην, A.*Pr.*1002/3. But (i) the fact that there the possessor of the γνώμη is explicitly identified by means of a genitive makes all the difference: here the lack of such an explicit reference to a deity makes clear that the γνώμα refers to the moral disposition of the generic human being who is the *topic* of the entire passage; (ii) the parallelism with 91/2 makes clear that the cause of the destruction of τὸ τερπνόν is located in the moral disposition of human beings, not in divine intervention.

[218] On this passage see my note on line 78 above, pp. 661/2.

S.*OT* 1314; πῦρ, Ar.*Eq*.792). All three connotations are relevant here. First, ἀπότροπος qualifies the γνώμα as morally repellent.[219] Second, the sense 'averting oneself' is relevant to the extent that it is implied that the moral disposition has changed for the worse so as to responsible for the annihilation of τὸ τερπνόν.[220] Third, in the light of the preceding imagery of success resulting in the person 'flying' who enjoys it, the wrong moral attitude 'averts' the τὸ τερπνόν, as if blowing it out of course, so as to make it 'fall on the ground.'

σείω means 'shaking, tossing' (of ἔγχεα, *Il*.13.135, αἰγίδα, *Il*.15.321, λόφον, Alc.388 V., A.*Th*.385, etc.). The verb is often used with the object γῆν of earthquakes (ὅστις νομίζει Ποσειδέωνα τὴν γῆν σείειν, Hdt.7.129, etc.; also without an object: ἔσειεν ὁ θεός, X.*HG* 4.7.4; cf. also σεισίχθων, *I*.1.52, an epithet of Poseidon). Thus, also in the passive, cf. αὐτὰρ νέρθε Ποσειδάων ἐτίναξε | γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ὀρέων τ' ἀπεινὰ κάρηνα. | πάντες δ' ἐσσείοντο πόδες πολυπίδακος Ἴδης | καὶ κορυφαί, Τρώων τε πόλις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν, *Il*.20.57-60; cf. Hdt.6.98. As earthquakes cause the destruction of builings (αὐτοῖς ὁ Ποσειδῶν σείσας ἐμβάλοι οἰκίας, Ar.*Ach*.511, *Lys*.1142), the verb can be used metaphorically, with an object referring to a house or city, in the sense of 'destroying, overthrowing, damaging' in an immaterial sense: ῥάιδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σεῖσαι καὶ ἀφαυροτέροις· | ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώρας αὖτις ἔσσαι δυσπαλὲς δὴ γίνεται, ἐξαπίνας | εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἀγεμόνεσσι κυβερνατὴρ γένηται, *P*.4.272-4, where with κυβερνατήρ, the imagery shifts to nautical.[221] Thus also, like here, in the passive: εὐδαίμονες οἷσι κακῶν ἄγευστος αἰών. οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῇ θεόθεν δόμος, ἄτας | οὐδὲν ἐλλείπειγενεᾶς ἐπὶ πλῆθος ἕρπον, S.*Ant*.583-5.

σεσεισμένον here is used in the metaphorical sense of 'overthrown, destroyed'; Pindar has extended the metaphorical usage in that he applies it to τὸ τερπνόν instead of a house, city, or the like. The verb conjures up the image of an earthquake,[222] which retrospectively specifies or re-defines the image implied by πίτνει χαμαί in the preceding line. The perfect presents the destruction as a definitive and irreversible state; τὸ τερπνόν falls on the ground and is 'ruined.'

---

[219] 'Improper,' Farnell *ad loc.*; cf. Slater, *CQ* 19, 1969, 93.

[220] 'Von Umkehr der Denkart zum Wanken gebracht,' Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 571 n. 14.

[221] Thus Gildersleeve *ad loc.*, Braswell *ad loc.* That σεῖσαι would also be an image drawn from nautical terminology is rendered unlikely by the following ἐπὶ χώρας αὖτις ἔσσαι. In τὰ πόλεος ... θεοὶ | πολλῶι σάλωι σείσαντες ὤρθωσαν πάλιν, S.*Ant*.162/3, the verb is used in the same metaphorical sense, but the other words of the *vehicle* are nautical; perhaps σείσαντες presupposes the image of the 'rolling, tossing' of a ship, but this usage is unparalleled. More probably, it is a mixed metaphor, σάλωι being drawn from nautical terminology, σείσαντες from earthquakes; ὤρθωσαν fits both *vehicles*.

[222] Thus Giannini *ad loc.* (in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 585).

EPODE E

95. ἐπάμεροι

A striking one word assessment of the *condition humaine:* 'creatures of one day.' A man's fortune changes so quickly (ἐν ὀλίγωι, 92), that he himself changes with each day.

Put prosaically, ἐπάμεροc denotes 'daily,' associating the person or thing it qualifies with a one day period, or a series of one day periods. The various connotations of the word are thoroughly documented by Hermann Fränkel, in his famous article, 'Man's "Ephemeros" Nature According to Pindar and Others', *TAPhA* 77, 1946, 131-45.[223] Three categories are to be discerned. (1) 'lasting for one day'; literally, of a dayfly (Arist.*HA* 552^{b}23, cf. 490^{a}34, *PA* 682^{a}26, Hp.*Aph.*4.55), or metaphorically in the sense of 'short-lived, transient,' as in: οὐκ ἂν ἐφημεριόc γε βάλοι δάκρυ, *Od.*4.233; νήπιοι ἀγροιῶται, ἐφήμερια φρονέοντεc, *Od.*21.85; Arist.*EN* 1096^{b}5, *Mete.*347^{b}21, etc. (2) 'daily,' i.e., 'again and again for just one day,' as in: ὁ δ' ἀνθανάτων μὴ θαραccέτω φθόνοc | ὅτι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων | ἕκαλοc ἔπειμι γῆραc ἔc τε τὸν μόρcιμον | αἰῶνα, *I.*7.39-42;[224] cf. Ascl.*Tact.*1.4, Plu.*Per.*16.5, Arist.*Pol.*1252^{b}16, Stob.1.1.13, etc. (3) 'daily, again and again for just one day,' with the specific connotation that every day is different (cf. αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναιc ἁμέραιc ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξάλλαξεν, *I.*3.18; ὡc ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια, S.*Aj.*131/2; τί γὰρ παρ' ἦμαρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει | προcθεῖcα κἀναθεῖcα τοῦ γε κατθανεῖν, *ibid.*475/6)[225], so 'changing with the day.' Cf. ὁ ὄλβοc οὐ βέβαιοc ἀλλ' ἐφήμεροc, E.*Ph.*558; ἰὼ ἰώ, πανδάκρυτ' ἐφαμέρων | ἔθνη πολύπονα, λεύccεθ', ὡc παρ' ἐλπίδαc | μοῖρα βαίνει· | ἕτερα δ' ἕτεροc ἀμείβεται | πήματ' ἐν χρόνωι μακρῶι· βροτῶν δ' ὁ πᾶc ἀcτάθμητοc αἰών, E.*Or.*976-81. For this usage, Fränkel helpfully compares: τοῖοc γὰρ νόοc ἐcτὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων | οἷον ἐπ' ἦμαρ ἄγηcι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, *Od.*18.136/7, 'the thoughts of men on earth depend on what Zeus brings for the day,' says Odysseus, after having observed that men who are favoured by the gods think that they will never suffer something bad again, but that someone whom the gods have striken with misfortune bears his ill

---

[223] A slightly altered German version is to be found in his *Wege und Formen*, pp. 23-39. See also *Dichtung und Philosophie*, pp. 148-50.

[224] Thus also Young, *Isthmian 7*, p. 31.

[225] Fränkel argues that the nouns ἦμαρ, ἡμέρα are often used as the "frame of some special occurrence or symbol of some prevailing condition" (p. 132), as in: ἤματι τῶι ὅτε, *Il.*3.189, 5.210, 'on that occasion when'; νόcτιμον ἦμαρ ἀφείλετο, ὤλετο, *Od.*1.9, 168, 354, etc.; ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούραc, *Il.*6.455, 16.831, 20.193. See also Woodbury, *TAPhA* 97, 1966, 604/5 n. 11.

fate patiently. Thus also in Archilochus' version: τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι θυμός, Γλαῦκε, Λεπτίνεω πάϊ, | γίνεται θνητοῖς, ὁποίην Ζεὺς ἐφ' ἡμέρην ἄγῃ, *fr.*131 W., which is perhaps followed by the line καὶ φρονέουσι τοῖ' ὁποίοις ἐγκυρέωσι ἔργμασιν, *fr.*132 W. (Bergk [*fr.*70] and Diehl [*fr.*68] take the three lines together). Cf. further Plu.*Mor.*20a, 41e, 821f, 1090b, 1104f, *Caes.*5.8, Diph.*Eun.*45, Th.2.53.2, with Fränkel pp. 142/3.

This is the sense of ἐπάμεροι here. It is "a comment not upon the brevity of man's life in our usual sense of the word ephemeral, but on the impermanence of his daily condition and on the attitude of mind imposed upon him by its transience" (Burton, *Pythian Odes*, pp. 191/2).[226] The same idea occurs, connected explicitly with man's inability to foresee the changes of fortune, in: ὦ παῖ, τέλος μὲν Ζεὺς ἔχει βαρύκτυπος | πάντων ὅσ' ἐστὶ καὶ τίθησ' ὅκῃ θέλει, | νοῦς δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν, ἀλλ' ἐπήμεροι | ἃ δὴ βοτὰ ζόουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰδότες | ὅκως ἕκαστον ἐκτελευτήσει θεός, Sem.1.1-5 W.[227] Cf. also ἐφαμερίαν οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκτας | ἄμμε πότμος | ἄντιν' ἔγραψε δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμαν, *N.*6.6/7.

95. τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὔ τις;

The impermanence of a man's daily condition, due to his total subjection to the whims of fate, gives rise to the question as to what, if this is so, man can be said to be. This question is asked in the most general form: 'What is someone?' The answer follows: 'Of dream a shadow is man.' The fact that the question is bipartite—'what is someone? what is someone not?—, underscores the variability of man's condition: "it cannot be said of man, a creature whose thoughts and feelings change with each day's changing fortunes, that he either is or is not the same person for more than a day" (Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 191). The consecutive stages of a man's fate and fortune follow upon one another so quickly that, if one wishes to define what he is, one already finds oneself attempting to define what he has ceased to be, so that one is forced to ask what he is not in order to get the answer to one's earlier question.[228] It is instructive to com-

---

[226] For a different opinion see Dickie, *ICS* 1, 1976, 7-14.

[227] On ἐπήμερος in this passage see further A. Carson, 'Semonides Fragment I', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy. Studies in honour of L. Woodbury* (ed. Gerber), Chico 1984, 62-5; Gerber, 'Semonides fr. 1 West', *ibid.* 127/8. For the ambiguity in ἐκτελευτήσει see my *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 410-2.

[228] Giannini, *QUCC* 11, 1982, 69-76, following the scholiast (135b, II 218/9 Dr.), suggests to render 'what is a somebody? what is a nobody?': "In sostanza: 'Che cos' è "qualcuno"? Che cos' è "nessuno"?' Ovviamente, qui 'qualcuno' e 'nessuno' esprimono un giudizio di valore e corrispondone a 'di una certa importanza' e 'di nessuna importanza,' cioè, nel caso specifico, 'famoso' e 'oscuro'." (pp. 71/2; repeated

pare: ποταμοῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐμβαίνομεν τε καὶ οὐκ ἐμβαίνομεν· εἶμέν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶμεν, Heracl.*fr.*22 B 49a DK.[229]

95-96. σκιᾶς ὄναρ | ἄνθρωπος

'Of shadow a dream is man.' This is a comment not upon the null and void insignificance of men, but upon their elusiveness because of the impermanence of their daily condition, due to their total subjection to the caprices of fortune.[230] Both shadow and dream are common images for something intangible or evasive. 'A dream of a shadow' is, so to speak, the superlative of this. Shadow and dream are two alternative similes for the intangibility and elusiveness of the shades from the underworld in: τρὶς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἴκελον ἢ καὶ ὀνείρωι | ἔπτατ', *Od.*11.207/8 (cf. ψυχὴ δ' ἠύτ' ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται, 222): they cannot be grasped, literally, as in our context here men's nature cannot be grasped intellectually because of the impermanence of their daily condition.[231] Cf. further: τὸ γὰρ βρότειον σπέρμ' ἐφήμερα φρονεῖ | καὶ πιστὸν οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἢ κάπνου σκία, A.*fr.*399 R. In τίς ἐφαμερίων ἄρηξις; οὐδ' ἐδέρχθης | ὀλιγοδρανίαν ἄκικυν ἰσόνειρον, ἆι τὸ φωτῶν | ἀλαὸν γένος ἐμπεποδισμένον; οὔποτε | τὰν Διὸς ἁρμονίαν θνατῶν παρεξίασι βουλαί, A.*Pr.*547-50, the emphasis is upon how powerless mortals are: they are feeble[232] (cf. ὀλιγοδρανίαν) and their plans will

---

in his note *ad h.l.* in Gentili *et al.*, *Pitiche*, p. 585). Giannini takes σκιᾶς ὄναρ | ἄνθρωπος to be the answer only to the second question, lines 96/7 then answering the first. This is far-fetched. The preceding ἐπάμεροι refers to the impermanence of men's condition, without distinguishing between the famous and the obscure. Giannini's interpretation is accepted by Ἰακώβ *ad loc.* (p. 307).

[229] Segal's suggestion (*QUCC* 22, 1976, 71-6), that Pindar intentionally refurbishes Mimnermus (τίς δὲ βίος, τί δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης; etc., *fr.*1 W.), is not supported by any similarity in words or themes (the fragment is about the fading charmes of youth); that Pindar was an old man when he wrote this poem, and that some old men ponder on the fading charms of youth, does not go to corroborate Segal's case.

[230] Bieler, *WS* 51, 1933, 143-5, regards σκιᾶς as a subjective genitive: 'a dream dreamt by a shadow, i.e., by a dead man.' Jüthner, *WS* 54, 1936, 142/3, rightly insists that this does not make sense in the context. Toohey, *QUCC* 26, 1987, attempts to reanimate Bieler's interpretation by taking 'shade, phantom' to be a metaphor for a man living without *charis*, i.e., not praised (p. 82). It is very difficult to give ὄναρ a place in this interpretation, as Toohey himself admits (p. 79 n. 26). The context is generic; it does not distinguish between men with and without fame and glory. Moreover, the idea of death is absent in the context, which makes the metaphorical interpretation of σκιά as 'dead man' unlikely; it is even less likely to go one step further and take 'dead man' in turn to be an image for 'man lacking *charis*.' See further Robbins, *Companion*, pp. 275/6.

[231] Dreams are often presented as moving quickly. Cf. βῆ δ' ἄρ' Ὄνειρος ... | καρπαλίμως δ' ἵκανε, *Il.*2.16/7; αὐτὴ δὲ (*sc.* Thetis), πνοιῇ ἰκέλη δέμας, ἠύτ' ὄνειρος, | βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐκ μεγάροιο θοῶς, A.R.4.877/8; cf. further *Od.*4.841, *Od.*20.87, etc.

[232] For dreams as an image for weakness, cf. πολιὸν αἰθέρος ἀφανὲς εἴδωλον ἢ | νέκυν ἔνερθεν ἢ πτανὸν ὄνειρον, E.*Phoen.*1543-5; ὥστ' ὄνειρον ἰσχύν, E.*Phoen.*1722, "'<being> like a dream in strength,' i.e., 'being as weak as a dream,' a convention-

never escape the arrangement of Zeus. Thus also: ἄγε δὴ φύσιν ἄνδρες ἀμαυρόβιοι, φύλλων γενεᾶι προσόμοιοι, | ὀλιγοδρανέες, λάσματα πηλοῦ, σκιοειδέα φῦλ' ἀμενηνὰ | ἀπτῆνες ἐφήμεροι ταλαοὶ βροτοὶ ἀνέρες εἰκελόνειροι, Ar.*Av*.685-7, which is possibly an intended allusion to the passage in the *Prometheus* (thus Griffith on A.*Pr*.548-50, p. 186), combined with the simile of the leaves in *Il*.6.146-9. εἴδωλον σκιᾶς, A.*Ag*.839, "denotes, as it were, the superlative of the unreal" (Fraenkel *ad loc.*); cf. S.*fr*.598.6. Similarly in: ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν | εἴδωλ', ὅσοιπερ ζῶμεν, ἢ κούφην σκιάν, S.*Aj*.125/6, said by Odysseus out of his awareness that a misfortune like Ajax' might once happen to him as well; the image stresses that men are powerless against fate and the gods (cf. Athena's reply in 127-33). Cf. further: τἄλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς | οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην, S.*Ant*.1170/1; κοὐκ οἶδ' ἐναίρων νεκρὸν ἢ καπνοῦ σκιάν, | εἴδωλον ἄλλως, S.*Ph*.946/7, Philoctetes commenting upon his own weakness; ἄνθρωπός ἐστι πνεῦμα καὶ σκιὰ μόνον, S.*fr*.12; οὐδέν ἐσμεν πλὴν σκιαῖς ἐοικότες, S.*fr*.945; τὰ θνητὰ δ' οὐ νῦν πρῶτον ἡγοῦμαι σκιάν, E.*Med*.1224.

96. ἀλλ' ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθηι

'But whenever god-given brilliance comes,' a man gets fame and a sweet life. The emphasis is on διόσδοτος. The divine origin of the αἴγλα ensures its higher degree of permanence. The formulations are generic, but Aristomenes is a clear example of someone whom was given 'god-given brilliance,' viz. a victory in one of the Great Games.

ἀλλά breaks off. "All in all the value of ἀλλά does not appear to consist in calling attention to an adversative relation between contents of sentences, but in replacing one proposition or other notion by another one which is nearer to the heart of the speaker's concerns" (Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 50). The preceding comments upon the quick changes of fortune and the impermanence of men's daily condition are rejected and substituted by the assertion that when glory is god-given, it results in fame and a sweet life, an assertion that is in fact "nearer to the heart of the speaker's concerns" to the extent that it is a generic statement which applies directly to the situation of the present victor and thus to the poet's encomiastic obligations.

For **αἴγλα**, 'radiance, brilliance,' cf. θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν, *N*.1.35, of day (cf. ἀγλαὸν ἐς φάος, *Pae*.12.15). It is a metaphor for 'glory' of an athletic victory in: πατρὸς δὲ Θεσσαλοῖ' ἐπ' Ἀλφεοῦ | ῥεέθροισιν αἴγλα ποδῶν ἀνάκειται, *O*.13.35/6; κῶμόν τ' ἀέθλων Πυθίων αἴγλαν στεφάνοις, *P*.3.73. For **διόσ-**

---

al image for the weakness of age," Mastronarde *ad loc.* (p. 632); γέροντες οὐδέν ἐσμεν ἄλλο πλὴν ψόφος | καὶ σχῆμ'. ὀνείρων δ' ἕρπομεν μιμήματα, E.*fr*.25. Cf. further A.*Ag*.82, A.R.2.197-9.

δοτοϲ cf. ὄλβιοϲ ὅϲτιϲ ἰδὼν κεῖν' εἶϲ' ὑπὸ χθόν'· οἶδε μὲν βίου τελευτάν, | οἶδεν δὲ διόϲδοτον ἀρχάν, *fr.* 137.

97. λαμπρὸν φέγγοϲ ἔπεϲτιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μείλιχοϲ αἰών

When glory is god-given, 'shining light attends men and a sweet life.' As often with expressions referring to light, **λαμπρὸν φέγγοϲ** is a metaphor for fame an glory. See my note on *N.*3.64 (pp. 370-2). For **αἰών** see my note on *N.*3.75 (pp. 646/7). For **μείλιχοϲ** cf. Χάριϲ δ', ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύχει τὰ μείλιχα θνατοῖϲ, *O.*1.30 (with Gerber, *ad loc.*); ἔτραπε μείλιχοϲ ὀργὰ παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον, *P.*9.43, of Apollo's desire for Cyrene.

ἀνδρῶν must be complement to ἔπεϲτιν,[233] because ἔπεϲτιν cannot stand without a complement and ἀνδρῶν is the only constituent available to perform this function. This is the only example of ἔπειμι with a genitive. It occurs with a dative in *N.*7.23, *O.*13.99. Possibly the case ties in with the usage of ἐπί in a local sense with the genitive (as in line 46 above, *O.*1.77, *P.*4.273, *N.*5.1, etc.).

98-100

Aegina, our mother, keep this city in her voyage of freedom, with Zeus and lord Aeacus, Peleus and the noble Telamon, and with Achilles.

98. Αἴγινα φίλα μᾶτερ

The nymph Aegina is literally the mother of Aeacus (cf. *N.*8.6-14, *Pae.*6.134 ff.), and thus the arch-mother of the Aeacids and all the scions of aristocratic families that traced their lineage back to them. φίλα is from the perspective of Pindar's Aeginetan audience. For φίλοϲ see further my note on line 13 above (p. 491).

98-99. ἐλευθέρωι ϲτόλωι | πόλιν τάνδε κόμιζε

ἐλευθέρωι implies that Pindar is referring to the political relations of Athens and Aegina. κόμιζε, 'preserve,' entails an entreaty to continue the situation of freedom; the choice of the *present* imperative is motivated by the fact that the action the person addressed is urged to take is already being performed at the moment of exhortation: 'Keep this city in her voyage of freedom' (transl. Bowra).[234] Apparently Pindar takes the view that the *polis* is already 'on a voyage

---

[233] Thus Boeckh II, 2, p. 66 ('fulgens lumen adest hominibus') and Slater (*s.v.* ἔπειμι, p. 184). Hummel regards ἀνδρῶν as an adnominal genitive with φέγγοϲ: '"il s'en suit un éclat brillant pour les hommes (litt. 'des hommes')" (*Syntaxe*, p. 118).

[234] For a different opinion see Robbins, *Companion*, p. 267 n. 44: "the present and aorist imperatives are equivalent in such phrases." For Robbins' criticism of my earlier views (*Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-165) see further interpretation, p. 451 above with n. 62.

of freedom' at the moment the ode is being sung. In his view, it has liberated itself from the yoke of foreign domination since the Athenian defeat at Coronea. Pindar explicitly expresses the wish that this will remain so. See further my interpretation, pp. 426-56.

For the present imperative having the force of urging the addresse to continue doing what he is doing already, it is instructive to compare the series of imperatives addressed to Hieron in: ἀλλ' ὅμως, κρέccον γὰρ οἰκτιρμοῦ φθόνος, | μὴ παρίει καλά. νώμα δικαίωι πηδαλίωι cτρατόν· ἀψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸc ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλῶccαν, *P.*1.85/6, "keep on doing the (admirable) things you have been doing thus far," Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 482 n. 56.[235] See further: Sicking, *Glotta* 69, 1991, 14-43 and 154-170, esp. pp. 157, 160/1; K. Nickau, 'Zum Verbalaspekt der Imperative in Aristophanes' Acharnern 1097-1142', *Glotta* 71, 1993, 158-66. For a prayer to a deity to grant the continuation of an existing situation,[236] cf. λίccομαι, παῖ Ζηνὸc Ἐλευθερίου, | Ἱμέραν εὐρυcθενέ' ἀμφιπόλει, cώτειρα Τύχα, *O.*12.1/2.

For **κομίζω** cf. ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέαc ... ἰανθεὶc ἀοιδαῖc | εὔφρων ἄρουραν ἔτι πατρίαν cφίcιν κόμιcον | λοιπῶι γένει, *O.*2.12-5; ἱκόμαν | οἴκαδ', ἀρχαίαν κομίζων πατρὸc ἐμοῦ, βαcιλευομέναν | οὐ κατ' αἶcαν, τάν ποτε Ζεὺc ὤπαcεν λαγέται | Αἰόλωι καὶ παιcὶ τιμάν, *P.*4.105-8; κόμιcε ... Πενηλόπεια, | παῖδα δὲ ὡc ἀτίταλλε, *Od.*18.322/3. For **ἐλεύθεροc** cf. τῶι πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτωι cὺν ἐλευθερίαι | Ὑλλίδοc cτάθμαc Ἱέρων ἐν νόμοιc ἔκτιccε, *P.*1.61/2 (cf. δᾶμον γεραίρων τράποι cύμφωνον ἐc ἡcυχίαν. λίccομαι νεῦcον, Κρονίων, ἥμερον | ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοίνιξ ὁ Τυρcανῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸc ἔχηι, ναυcίcτονον ὕβριν ἰδὼν τὰν πρὸ Κύμαc, οἷα Cυρακοcίων ἀρχῶι δαμαcθέντεc πάθον, | ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὅ cφιν ἐν πόντωι βάλεθ' ἁλικίαν, | Ἑλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείαc δουλίαc, 70-5; cf. also *P.*2.57, where ἐλευθέραι φρενί refers to Hieron's attitude as a ruler). In *I.*8.15, ἐλευθερία is to be connected with μεγάλων δὲ πενθέων λυθέντεc (6) and παυcάμενοι δ' ἀπράκτων κακῶν | γλυκύ τι δαμωcόμεθα καὶ μετὰ πόνον· | ἐπειδὴ τὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλᾶc | γε† Ταντάλου λίθον παρά τιc ἔτρεψεν ἄμμι θεόc, | ἀτόλματον Ἑλλάδι μόχθον, 7-11, which refers to the aversion of the Persian invasion; cf. also ὅθι παῖδεc Ἀθαναίων ἐβάλοντο φαεννὰν | κρηπῖδ' ἐλευθερίαc, *fr.*77. For **cτόλοc** see my note on *N.*3.17 (pp. 274-6). The metaphor 'ship' for *polis* is common, cf. e.g. Alc.*fr.*208 V., Thgn.667-82, A.*Th.*2/3 and *passim*, S.*OT.*22ff., Pl.*R.*488, Hor.*C.*1.14; cf. ἀεὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ τὰc πόλειc τοῖc πλοίοιc παραβάλλουcι, Σ. *ad* Ar.*Vesp.*29. See also J. Dumortier, *Les Images dans la poésie d'Eschyle*, Paris

---

[235] Robbins, *Companion*, pp. 266/7 n. 43, says: "the imperatives addressed to Hieron ... pretend that the qualities he is encouraged to manifest already exist. They may in actual fact *not* exist but the poet tactfully suggests that they do." This may be true. But would this tactful presentation not depend exactly on the fact that the present tense stem form conveys the information that the addressee is already doing what he is entreated to do?

[236] Robbins, *Companion*, p. 266, insists that "in a prayer the thing prayed for does not usually exist yet — it is called into being by the invocation if the patronage solicited is granted."

1935, chapter 3; D. van Nes, *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos*, Diss. Utrecht, Groningen 1963, 92 (citing *O.*6.100ff., *P.*1.86, 4.274, 10.72, *I.*5.48ff (?), *fr.*109.1 as instances of nautical metaphor in Pindar).

99-100. Δὶ καὶ κρέοντι cὺν Αἰακῶι | Πηλεῖ τε κἀγαθῶι Τελαμῶνι cύν τ' Ἀχιλλεῖ

Aeacus, the arch-father of the Aeginetans, Zeus, his father, and the Aeacids, his offspring, are entreated to assist mother Aegina in preserving the island's freedom.[237] The avoidance of symmetry is exemplary (see introduction, pp. 51/2). The four generations are separated by cύν, verse-end, and cύν again. The two brothers are closely connected by means of τε καί. For Δὶ καὶ κρέοντι cὺν Αἰακῶι cf. Ἑρμᾶι καὶ cὺν Ἡρακλεῖ, *N.*10.53.

---

[237] For the finale consisting in a list of grand names Schroeder *ad loc.* (p. 75) compares: 'Im Namen des Vaters und des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes. Amen.'

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

NEMEAN V

N.5.43. ἤτοι μεταΐξαις cὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόcπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα

"No line in Pindar has experienced rougher usage at the hands of commentators than this." (Bury *ad loc.*, p. 95). Gerber, *Emendations*, pp. 109/10, lists no less than thirty different conjectures affecting this line. The mss. have ἦτοι μεταΐξαντα καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόcπορον ἔθνος Πυθέας, which does not make sense. Some Triclinian mss. have μεταΐξας γε, which gives acceptable syntax; the insertion of γε, however, looks very much like a typically Triclinian conjecture. A problem with both readings is that τεὸς μάτρως can only be an apposition to Πυθέας, characterizing Pytheas as Euthymenes' maternal uncle, while according to ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου | τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἰcθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας, | ἀγλαοὶ παῖδές τε καὶ μάτρως, *I*.6.60-2, it was the other way around. A scholiast on this line says that Pindar uses μάτρως less specifically in the sense of 'relative from one's mother's side' (μήτρως ἢ ὁ τῆς μητρὸς ἀδελφὸς ἢ ὁ κατὰ μητέρα συγγενής· χρῆται γὰρ οὕτως ὁ Πίνδαρος, 78a, III 97 Dr.): then Pytheas must be the son of a sister[1] of Euthymenes' mother.[2] There is, however, no evidence to confirm the scholiast's interpretation. It is probably an *ad hoc* interpretation meant to reconcile this line with the passage from *I*.6 quoted. Another scholiast on this line says: καταλληλότερον δὲ ἔνιοι γράφουσι, ἵν' ἦι ὁ μήτρως Πυθέας (78c, III 97 Dr.), which is indeed what our mss. read, but which implies that this scholiast was familiar with texts that did not read the nominative Πυθέας (cf. Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 291). Thus there are strong arguments in favour of accepting Mignarelli's easy emendation Πυθέα, altering the nominative to a vocative,[3] which makes Euthymenes Pytheas' μάτρως as *I*.6 has it.[4]

However, also with the vocative, the reading of both older mss. does

---

[1] The possibility that Pytheas' father was a brother of Euthymenes' mother would also fit this place, but has to be excluded because of *I*.6.60-2, where Euthymenes is called Pytheas' and Phylacidas' μάτρως.

[2] Severyns, *Bacchylide*, p.41 n.5, does not exclude this possibility.

[3] The scholion practically gives the vocative the status of an ancient *varia lectio*. Cf. my *CQ* 45, 1995, 320 n. 13.

[4] The alternative, to put the uncle in the accusative (γ' ἑὸν μάτρω, Heyne; τεὸν μάτρω, Hóman, Fennell, Postgate), is less convincing.

not make sense. If we want to take this reading as our starting point, keeping μεταΐξαντα instead of μεταΐξαις γε, it is best to adopt Bergk's conjecture and insert c' after μάτρωϲ (presupposing an entirely plausible haplography). Thus we get: ἦτοι μεταΐξαντα καὶ νῦν τεὸϲ μάτρωϲ c' ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόϲπορον ἔθνοϲ, Πυθέα. This is the text printed by Bowra in his OCT edition. It gives reasonable sense: 'Since you have followed after him, also now your uncle is doing honour to you, Pytheas, who are related to that man (i.e., Peleus, *v.i.*) as far as the nation is concerned,' taking the participle with c', supplying Euthymenes as its object, taking ὁμόϲπορον with c' and ἔθνοϲ as an accusative of aspect with the adjective.[5] The main problems with this reading are that ὁμόϲπορον and ἔθνοϲ cannot be taken together and that it is not entirely clear why Euthymenes would honour Pytheas by being his example. One would rather expect it to be the other way around, the follower honouring his example with his recent victory, as it always is in Pindar (cf. *P.*8.36 with my note, p. 521).

It is preferable to take the reading of some of the byzantine mss. as a starting point and change γε to a second person accusative pronoun: μεταΐξαιϲ ϲε (Turyn).[6] This conjecture presupposes a corruption in two phases: first ϲε was omitted *per haplographiam* in an early stage of the tradition[7]; later the metre was restored by inserting γε, the well-tried Triclinian method. Thus we get: ἦτοι μεταΐξαιϲ ϲὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸϲ μάτρωϲ ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόϲπορον ἔθνοϲ, Πυθέα, which is the text printed in the Snell-Maehler edition. 'Having rushed after you, Pytheas, now also your uncle does honour to that hero's (i.e., Peleus') kindred race (i.e., the Aeginetans).' It may seem paradoxical at first sight that Euthymenes, the uncle, has followed after Pytheas,

[5] In his 1969 Penguin translation Bowra translates: 'And now you also, Pytheas, / Have sprung after him, / And your mother's brother exalts you, / A scion of the same stock as Peleus.'

[6] The same conjecture had already been made by Rauchenstein, 'Erklärung der fünften nemeischen Ode Pindars', *Neues Schweizerisches Museum* 3, 1863, 250-3. Wilamowitz' μεταΐξαϲ τε is less convincing. The form of the pronoun is problematic, especially here as it is followed by καί. It has been proposed as an emendation in a few more places (e.g.*N.*6.60: τό γ' ἐπάρκεϲε codd.: τέ γ' ἐπαρκέϲαι P. Maas: τὺ δ' ἐπάρκεϲαϲ Bowra). The only passage where it might be the mss.-reading is *O.*1.48; but there it is probably better taken as corresponding with τ' in line 50. See Gerber *ad loc.* Wilamowitz' τε may seem *difficilior* at first sight, but in fact the presupposed corruption is more difficult to account for, as τε is less likely than ϲε to have dropped out *per haplographiam.* For the ending of the participle see C. Verdier, *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare,* Innsbruck 1972, 134-40; B.K. Braswell, '*Color Epicus* in Pindar. A Falsely Assumed Type', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury* (ed. D.E. Gerber), Chico 1984, 33-6.

[7] The same error occurs at *P.*2.66 and *O.*12.16. Unmotivated omission of ϲε occurs at *P.*4.1.

the younger cousin; however, it makes excellent sense if one of Euthymenes' two Aeginetan victories mentioned in the preceding lines was posterior to Pytheas' Nemean victory.[8] In fact, not only does this explain why καὶ νῦν emphatically characterizes Euthymenes' honouring his race as something that has happened only recently, it also helps to explain why, contrary to Pindar's usual practice, Euthymenes' victories are mentioned before the praise of the victor himself: the exceptional circumstance that, in the period between Pytheas' victory and the celebrations, the victor's uncle had won a victory in local Aeginetan games calls for a special treatment. Moreover, the value of ἤτοι is to draw attention to a paradoxical circumstance (see below).

It is an error of method to use the scholia on line 37 (Εὐθυμένης ὃς ἐνίκησεν Ἴσθμια, 67a, III 96 Dr.) and 38 (εἶτα ἐποίσει διὰ τί τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐμνήσθη, 70b, III 96 Dr.) as an argument to restore by conjecture a reference to an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes in this line.[9] It is said in *I*.6.60-2 that Euthymenes has won twice on the Isthmus. So the remark of the scholiast on line 37 is in fact true, although Euthymenes' Isthmian victories must be posterior to this ode. The remark of the scholiast on line 38 does not prove that this scholiast had a text before him in which an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes was mentioned in line 43; he can perfectly well have meant to say that the lines 38-41, which establish the transition to the family of the victor, form a justification of the mentioning of the Isthmian Games in line 37.

T. Cole's recent conjecture μεταλλάξασθε (*Pindar's Feasts*, 138/9: 'The two of you have changed places, and now it is your uncle who is doing the honours ..., Pytheas') is unconvincing. First μεταλλάσσω means 'to change, alter' and not 'to change places.'[10] Second, it is not easy to account for the presupposed scribal error. Third, it seems a rather uncomplimentary thing to say to the victor in whose honour this ode is sung 'Look, surprisingly you have changed places and now your uncle is the big man'.

ἤτοι: It is clear that this is not a case of disjunctive ἤτοι (i.e., a compound of ἤ and τοι, as in *N*.6.5 and possibly in *P*.12.29), but that it is

---

[8] Thus P. Maas, 'Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar', *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* 39, 1913, 316/7. Cf. Carey, *CQ* 39, 1989, 291. It cannot be excluded entirely that *both* Euthymenes' Aeginetan victories were won in the period between Pytheas' victory and the current celebration, but then we would have to assume that Euthymenes' victories were won in two different disciplines; one would expect Pindar to mention such an unusual detail (cf. line 52 below).

[9] E.g. Ἰσθμοῖ τ' ἐπεὶ νίκης (= ἐνίκας) τὰ καὶ ... Πυθέας, Mezger; Ἰσθμοῖ τ' ἀΐξας ἄντα. καὶ ... Πυθέα, Bury.

[10] Unless this is made explicit, as e.g. in οὐ γὰρ τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον μετήλλαξεν, Aeschin.3.78.

a compound of ἦ and τοι. The use of this particle is confined mainly to epic diction (196 occurences in Homer, 13 in Hesiod[11]). It does not occur in Plato and Aristophanes. C.J. Ruijgh, 'L'emploi de ἤτοι chez Homère et Hésiode', *Mnemosyne* 34, 1981, 272-87, has made plausible that ἤτοι in epic can be regarded as a synonym of preparative μέν ("la particule épique ἤτοι est simplement le quasi-synonyme de μέν préparatif, particule qui sert le plus souvent de coordonnant préparatif dans la construction μέν—δέ [ou αὐτάρ, ἀτάρ, ἀλλά] mais qui s'emploie parfois en dehors de la coordination [μέν non correspondsif, μέν solitaire]", p. 272). One should, however, be cautious in extrapolating these observations on epic diction to the usage of this particle in Pindar. ἤτοι plays this specific role of 'quasi-synonym' of preparative μέν in epic idiom because of the restrictions put upon the poet by the formulaic nature of his verses. μέν, unlike ἤτοι, cannot take first position in a sentence and apparently it was convenient to have this alternative at one's disposal. These considerations do not apply to Pindar, since his poetry was not orally composed in the way epic was.[12] Here the possibility of ἤτοι being an imitation of epic ἤτοι, serving as 'quasi-synonym' of preparative μέν, is excluded because the following sentence has μέν.[13] There is evidence that Pindar uses 'emphatic' ἤτοι truly as a compound of ἦ and τοι, i.e., as a particle combination expressing that he makes a statement which the hearer may believe to be untrue, but nevertheless is true (ἦ)[14] and moreover asks for the special attention of the hearer because it may in a way surprise him (τοι, see my note on line 48 below, pp. 611-3). ἤτοι here is motivated by the exceptional circumstance that, after

---

[11] The relative frequency is one occurrence of ἤτοι in every 142 lines in Homer, 1:291 in Hesiod, according to Ruijgh, *Mnemosyne* 34, 1981, 286.

[12] The only certain example of 'epic' ἤτοι in Pindar is an example of epic ἤτοι μέν: ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι, | τίνα θεόν, τίνα ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; | ἤτοι Πίσα μὲν Διός· Ὀλυμπιάδα δ' ἔστασεν Ἡρακλέης | ... | Θήρωνα δὲ ... | γεγωνητέον, *O.*2.1-6. ἤτοι μέν occurs 44 times in Homer, ἤτοι ... μέν 49 times.

[13] There is one parallel in Homer for ἤτοι followed by μέν: κέκλυτέ μευ, Τρῶες καὶ εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαίοι· | ἤτοι ἐγὼν εἶμι προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν | ἄψ, ἐπεὶ οὔ πω τλήσομ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρᾶσθαι | μαρνάμενον φίλον υἱὸν ἀρηιφίλωι Μενελάωι. | Ζεὺς μέν που τό γε οἶδε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι, | ὁπποτέρωι θανάτοιο τέλος πεπρωμένον ἐστίν, *Il.*3.304-9. Ruijgh (p. 282) tries to explain this instance by stating that "le second membre est remplacé par la phrase introduite par ἐπεί (cf. μέν en *Il.*11.277)". ἤτοι rather points at the implicit polarity between ἐγών and the others, mentioned in the vocative: 'I don't know what you do, but I am going back to Troy'.

[14] "In communicating with an audience just as the need to deny a proposition expressly may be felt when there is a suspicion that the audience is disposed to assent to this proposition, so there may be good reasons for explicitly affirming what the audience may be inclined to disbelieve or disregard, which is precisely the use of ἦ", Sicking, *Particle Usage*, p. 55.

Pytheas' victory, his uncle had won a victory in local Aeginetan games, so that, paradoxically, the uncle has followed after the younger cousin. ἦτοι signals the speaker's awareness of the fact that his audience may be inclined to believe the statement (that the uncle has folllowed after the cousin) to be untrue (ἦ, 'really') and calls for their special attention (τοι, 'listen') because the statement may in a way be surprising to them.

Cf. τελεῖ δὲ θεῶν δύναμιc καὶ τὰν παρ' ὅρκον καὶ παρὰ ἐλπίδα κούφαν κτίcιν. | ἦτοι καὶ ὁ καρτερὸc ὁρμαίνων ἕλε Βελλεροφόνταc, | φάρμακον πραῢ τείνων ἀμφὶ γένυι, | ἵππον πτερόεντ'· ἀναβαὶc δ' εὐθὺc ἐνόπλια χαλκωθεὶc ἔπαιζεν, *O.*13.83-6; here, admittedly, ἦτοι is balanced by a corresponding δ' (86), but its force is clearly more specific than that of a preparative μέν: the preceding gnomic verse raises the expectancy that an example of an extremely extraordinary accomplishment is going to be given, and, as is explicitly marked by καί, the fact that Bellerophon ('it is really true, although you might believe otherwise and although it sounds surprising') got hold of the winged horse Pegasus is such an extraordinary accomplishment. Cf. also υἱὲ Φιλάνοροc, ἦτοι καὶ τεά κεν | ἐνδομάχαc ἅτ' ἀλέκτωρ cυγγόνῳ παρ' ἑcτίᾳ | ἀκλεὴc τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόηcεν ποδῶν, | εἰ μὴ cτάcιc ἀντιάνειρα Κνωcίαc c' ἄμερcε πάτραc. | νῦν δ' Ὀλυμπίᾳ cτεφανωcάμενοc κτλ, *O.*12.13-7; here one also might argue that ἦτοι is balanced by a corresponding δ' (17), but here too its function is more specific: ἦτοι signals the poet's awareness that the statement that Ergoteles' exile, due to civil war in Crete, was a *fortunate* coincidence may be believed to be untrue (but it is true nevertheless), and that it may surprise his audience. Cf. also ἦτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται | πεῖραc οὔ τι θανάτου, *O.*2.30/1; ἦτοι τό τ' θεcπέcιον Φόρκοι' ἀμαύρωcεν γένοc, *P.*12.13; ἦτοι καὶ ἐγὼ c[κόπ]ελον ναίων διαγινώcκομαι μὲν ἀρεθαῖc ἀέθλων | Ἑλλανίcιν, *Pae.*4.21-3.

The verb **μεταΐccω** ('rush after') is Homeric: κτεῖνε μεταΐccων, *Il.*16.398; καί με μεταΐξαc μάρψῃ ταχέεccι πόδεccι, 21.564; μεταΐξαc ῥοπάλῳ ἐκ θυμὸν ἕλοιτο, *Od.*17.236; μεταΐξαc θάνατον τεύξειεν ἑκάcτῃ, 20.11. It occurs only *h.l.* in Pindar. The simplex is frequent in Homer (*Il.*5.81, 11.484, 17.460, 18.506, *Od.*10.495, etc.). It is attested in the suspected reading of the MSS. of *N.*8.40-2 (αὔξεται δ' ἀρετά, χλωραῖc ἀέρcαιc ὡc ὅτε δένδρεον ἀΐccει[15], | ⟨ἐν⟩[16] cοφοῖc ἀνδρῶν ἀερωεῖc ἐν δικαίοιc τε πρὸc ὑγρὸν | αἰθέρα) and probably in *fr.*33a (ἐπὶ δὲ cτρατὸν ἄϊc[c' οὐκ ἴcοc cθένει πυρ]ὸc οὔτε θαλάc[cαc κύμαcιν οὔτ' ἀνέ]μοιcιν[17]). The simplex occurs also in later authors (A.*Pr.*837, S.*OC* 1261, E.*Supp.*962, *Ion* 328, Pl.*Alc.*1.118b, Is.4.10, etc.). For the metaphor cf. παλαιcμάτεccι γὰρ ἰχνεύων ματραδελφεούc, *P.*8.35 (with my note, pp. 519/20).

---

[15] Codd. contra metr.: δένδρεον ἄιccει Boeckh: δένδρεον οἴναc Bury: δενδρέου ἔρνοc Schroeder: F. Vogt replaces αὔξεται by ἀΐccει, stating a lacuna in the place of ἀΐccει, which has been taken over by Snell, and which seems in fact the best solution.

[16] Suppl. Boeckh.

ἀγάλλομαι ('glory, exult') is not unfrequent in Homer (τεύχεα δ' Ἕκτωρ | αὐτὸς ἔξων ὤμοιςι ἀγάλλεται Αἰακίδαο, *Il.*17.472/3; νήπιος, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε κακὰς ὑπὸ κῆρας ἀλύξας | ἵπποιςιν καὶ ὄχεςφιν ἀγαλλόμενος παρὰ νηῶν | ἂψ ἀπονοςτήςειν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεςςαν, *Il.*12.113-5; cf. 2.462, *Od.*5.176; cf. also Hes.*Th.*68, Archil.*fr.*5 W., Hdt.1.143, Th.2.44, etc.). The only (probable) occurrance of the middle in Pindar is: οὔθ' ἵπ[οιςι]ν ἀγαλλόμ[ενος], *fr.*215b.12/3. For the verb in connection with victory, cf. καὶ μήτε νικέων ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο, Archil.*fr.*128.4 W. The active is first attested in Pindar, here and in τὸν (*sc.* Πέλοπα) μὲν ἀγάλλων θεὸς | ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσεον πτεροῖςίν τ' ἀκάμαντας ἵππους, *O.*1.86/7[18]. In later authors the active is commonly used of a human 'honouring, glorifying' a deity (e.g. ἄγαλλε Φοῖβον, Ar.*Th.*128, cf. Pl.*Lg.*931a; ςε θυςίαιςιν ἱεραῖςι ... | ... ὦ δέςποτ' ἀγαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς ἀεί, Ar.*Pax* 398/9). If this was felt to be the standard practice in Pindar's time, κείνου ὁμόςπορον ἔθνος, the people of Aegina, are raised to the level of the gods, by means of the collocative meaning of the verb, which can factually be accounted for since their descendance is lineally traced back to Zeus.[19]

κείνου ὁμόςπορον ἔθνος characterizes the Aeginetans as kindred to Peleus. The only probable candidate for the reference of κείνου is Peleus. κεῖνος is often used to refer to a person that has not been mentioned for a long time (e.g. κεῖνον in *O.*1.101, referring to Hieron, last mentioned in line 23; see Des Places, *Pronom*, 67/8). Peleus (last mentioned by name in line 26, last referred to by οἱ in line 34) is more probable than, e.g., Zeus (35), because he was the main character of the myth and is therefore more likely to be still prominently present in the audience's conciousness. ὁμόςπορος, literally 'from the same seed,' presents the Aeginetan as linear descendants from the Aeacids.

ὁμόςπορος may be used to refer to brothers or sisters, whose mutual relation can be characterized by reference to the fact that they have come forth out of the same seed (e.g. οὔ τοι [*sc.* Demeter] ἀεικὴς | γαμβρὸς ἐν ἀθανάτοις πολυςημάντωρ Ἀϊδωνεὺς | αὐτοκαςίγνητος καὶ ὁμόςπορος, *h.Cer.*83-5; οἱ δ' ὧδ' ἐτελέτευςαν ὑπ' ἀλλαλοφόνοις | χερςὶν ὁμοςπόροιςιν, A.*Th.*929-31, Eteocles and Polynices, cf. βαςιλέοιν δ' ὁμοςπόροιν, 820; cf. 932, etc.; τῆς τυθείςης νηλεῶς ὁμοςπόρου, A.*Ch.*242, Electra referring to Iphigeneia; τοιοῦτος εἴη τῶν ἐμῶν ὁμοςπόρων | ὅςπερ λέλειπται· καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἐγώ, ξένοι, | ἀνάδελφός εἰμι, E.*IT* 611-3, Iphigeneia speaks to Orestes, not knowing that she is in fact talking to her brother; cf. *ibid.* 695). In

---

[17] Suppl. Lobel, Snell e Quint.8.6.71 (*Herculis impetum adversus Meropas, qui in insula Coo dicuntur habitasse, non igni nec ventis nec mari, sed fulmini similem fuisse*).

[18] Cf. Ποςειδῶν τε μειδιῶν ἐς τὸ μειράκιον (*sc.* Πέλοπα) καὶ ἀγάλλων αὐτὸ ἵπποις, Philostrat.*Im.*1.30.1.

[19] If this collocative meaning is in fact operative, *O.*1.86/7, where the order would be reversed, might have struck the audience as unusual in an even higher degree. See Gerber *ad loc.* (pp. 133/4).

Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* the qualification is used to characterize the relation between Oedipus and Laius, having the same wife: (Oedipus speaks:) ἔχων μὲν ἀρχὰς ἃς ἐκεῖνος [*sc.* Laius] εἶχε πρίν, | ἔχων δὲ λέκτρα καὶ γυναῖχ' ὁμόσπορον, 259/60, where Iocaste can be thus called, because she has recieved the seed of both Laius and Oedipus; in φανήσεται ... τοῦ πατρὸς | ὁμόσπορός τε καὶ φονεύς, 457-60, Tiresias uses the qualification with an active sense ('sowing your seed in the same woman'), enigmatically referring to the fact that Oedipus has the same wife as his father.[20]

Pindar uses **ἔθνος** to refer to any large group of people. In *O.*1.66 (τὸ ταχύποτμον ... ἀνέρων ἔθνος), *P.*10.28 (βροτὸν ἔθνος), *N.*3.74 (βρότεον ἔθνος), and *N.*11.42 (θνατὸν ... ἔθνος) it is used for the mortal race as a whole, as opposed to the gods. In *O.*10.97 (κλυτὸν ἔθνος Λοκρῶν), *I.*6.32 (Μερόπων ἔθνεα), and *Pae.*6.63/4 (Δελφῶν | ἔθ[ν]ος), as well as in *P.*4.252 (Λαμνιᾶν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων),[21] the noun refers to what we would call a nation, a *polis*. In *fr.*83 (ἦν ὅτε σύας Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔνεπον) it may refer to a collection of *poleis*.

*N.*5.48. τοι

The particle τοι has a strongly interactive character. By using τοι the speaker asks for the special attention of his hearer.[22] There may be several reasons for doing so. A few instances can be found in Pindar where it is motivated by the fact that the poet reaches a point of great importance or a point that is particularly close to the hearer's concerns.

A clear example of this is: ἦλθέ τοι | Νεμέας ἐξ ἐρατῶν ἀέθλων | παῖς ἐναγώνιος, ὃς ... | νῦν {τε} πέφανται | οὐκ ἄμμορος ἀμφὶ πάλαι κυναγέτας, *N.*6.11-4, where, after the gnomic introduction, τοι directs the hearer's attention to the victory in honour of which this ode is being sung. In ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής, | ὅταν τις ἀρετᾷ κεκραμένον καθαρᾷ | βροτήσιος ἀνὴρ πότμου παραδόντος αὐτὸν ἀνάγῃ | πολύφιλον ἑπέταν. | ὦ θεόμορ' Ἀρκεσίλα, | σύ τοί νιν κλυτᾶς | αἰῶνος ἀκρᾶν βαθμίδων ἄπο | σὺν εὐδοξίᾳ μετανίσεαι, *P.*5.1-8, the particle τοι (6) asks for the special attention of the addressee because the preceding general statement is applied to him personally.

---

[20] Whereas ὁμόσπορος has no double meaning in line 260 (of course, it is relevant to the spectators that Iocaste is 'related, kindred' to Oedipus, as being his mother, but this thought is not activated by ὁμόσπορος, since mother and son cannot be said to come forth out of the same seed), here the double meaning is relevant: Oedipus can be supposed not to understand the intended meaning of Tiresias' words and to interpret ὁμόσπορος in the normal way, which results in a truism ('you are of the same seed as your father', i.e. 'you are related to your father').

[21] Since the women of Lemnos killed their husbands, this expression refers to the *polis* as a whole.

[22] This is in accordance with the etymological affinity of this particle with the dative of the personal pronoun of the second person. See also Denniston, p. 537.

A particular case of the speaker drawing attention to the fact that he reaches a point that is particularly close to the concerns of his addressee is the situation that the speaker answers a question which has been posed earlier.

Cf. τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὖτε φρενὸς εὐκλέας ὀιστοὺς ἱέντες; ἐπί τοι | Ἀκράγαντι τανύσαις | αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόωι, *O*.2.89-92; ἀλλ' ἀοιδᾶν | ῥόθια δεκομένα κατερεῖς, πόθεν ἔλαβες ναυπρύτανιν | δαίμονα καὶ τὰν θεμίξενον ἀρετ[άν]. | ὁ πάντα τοι τά τε καὶ τὰ τεύχων σὸν ἐγγυάλιξεν ὄλβον | εὐρύο[πα] Κρόνου παῖς, *Pae*.6.128-34.

The particle τοι has special affinity for statements that are in a way surprising. The speaker asks for the attention of the hearer because he is aware (or presupposes) that his addressee will be amazed by what he is saying.[23]

Cf. Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀγλαΐαισιν δ' ἀστυνόμοις ἐπιμεῖξαι | λαόν. ἐντί τοι φίλιπποί τ' αὐτόθι καὶ κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας | ἄνδρες. ἄπιστον ἔειπ'· αἰδὼς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει κλέπτεται, | ἃ φέρει δόξαν, *N*.9.31-4; here the *scope* of τοι consists mainly of the second of the two word-groups coordinated by τε and καί: it may sound amazing that the people of Aetnae are superior to pursuit of profit; this surprising assertion is explicitly characterized as something which can expected to meet with disbelief. Another example is: ἴστε μὰν Αἴαντος ἀλκάν, φοίνιον τὰν ὀψίαι | ἐν νυκτὶ ταμὼν περὶ ᾧι φασγάνωι μομφὰν ἔχει παίδεσσι Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν. | ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, *I*.4.35-7, where the statement that Homer honoured Ajax is surprising in the light of what has been said in the preceding lines. Cf. μᾶτερ ἐμά, τὸ τεόν, χρύσασπιδι Θήβα, | πρᾶγμα καὶ ἀσχολίας ὑπέρτερον | θήσομαι, μή μοι κραναὰ νεμεσάσαι | Δᾶλος, ἐν ᾇ κέχυμαι. | ... | εἶξον, ὦ Ἀπολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος, *I*.1.1-6, where the hearer gets the impression that Delos as a theme will have to make way for Thebes, until the poet promises to combine both themes in his present poem. This promise is surprising in the light of the preceding verses and τοι serves to attract the hearer's attention to this. The *scope* of τοι here is primarily confined to the preceding word. Cf. also: εἴ τι καὶ φλαῦρον παραιθύσσει, μέγα τοι φέρεται | πὰρ σέθεν, *P*.1.87/8, where τοι may be doubly motivated: in the first place the point is of special relevance for Hieron personally, the person addressed, and secondly μέγα is not what would be expected in the light of εἴ τι καὶ φλαῦρον. An illustrative example of τοι attracting the hearer's attention to a statement which is surprising in itself, regardless of the context, is: Ἀΐδα τοι λάθεται | ἄρμενα πράξαις ἀνήρ, *O*.8.72/3. Cf. also οὔ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων | φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκής, lines 16/7 above (with my note, pp. 122-4).

Here the function of τοι is not immediately clear. The praise of the trainer is not a point that is particularly close to the addressee's con-

---

[23] This comes close to the observation made made by Denniston (p. 537) that "its primary function is to bring home to the comprehension of the person addressed a truth of which he is ignorant, or temporarily ignorant".

cerns, nor is the statement in which τοι appears an answer to a preceding question. We would be able to understand τοι if the assertion 'sweet was the recompense you got because you had Menander' would be something surprising to say and something which can expected to meet with disbelief.[24] μηκέτι ῥίγει in line 50 implies that Menander's Athenian origin was regarded as an unfortunate coincidence. If the hypothesis that this ode was performed during a war between Athens and Aegina (see my *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-32, and interpretation, pp. 66-88) is accepted, we could understand why Menander's Athenian origin was regarded as problematic; then the particle τοι would signal the poet's awareness of the fact that his statement—that it was by means of collaborating with an Athenian that Pytheas had been successful—had an element of paradox to it for the Aeginetan audience. By betraying this awareness (more explicitly in the following lines), projecting himself into his audience's anti-Athenian sentiments, Pindar creates the feeling that he is on their side.

Nemean III

*N.*3.9. μῆτις

• *Homer:* In Homer μῆτις is used both to refer to a mental quality ('know-how, skill') and to manifestations of this ('counsel, plan').

An illuminating example of the first use is *Il.*23.313-22, where Nestor, advising his son how to win the chariot-race, dwells on the importance of μῆτις: ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ cὺ φίλος μῆτιν ἐμβάλλεο θυμῶι | παντοίην, ἵνα μή cε παρεκπροφύγηιcιν ἄεθλα. | μήτι τοι δρυτόμος μεγ' ἀμείνων ἠὲ βίηφι· | μήτι δ' αὖτε κυβερνήτης ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντωι | νῆα θοὴν ἰθύνει ἐρεχθομένην ἀνέμοιcι· | μήτι δ' ἡνίοχος περιγίγνεται ἡνιόχοιο. | ἀλλ' ὃς μέν θ' ἵπποιcι καὶ ἅρμαcιν οἷcι πεποιθὼς | ἀφραδέως ἐπὶ πολλὸν ἑλίccεται ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα | ἵπποι δὲ πλανάονται ἀνὰ δρόμον οὐδὲ κατίcχει· | ὃς δέ κε κέρδεα εἰδῆι ἐλαύνων ἥccονας ἵππους, κτλ. In line 315 μῆτις is opposed to βίη: it is in some cases, as for the wood-cutter, more effective than force and it is as essential for the steersman as it is for the chariot-driver. The driver using μῆτις is characterized as someone knowing κέρδεα (322, cf. *Od.*13.297-9, *v.i.*) and opposed to someone who operates whithout thought (ἀφραδέως, 320). In this passage μῆτις is what we would call 'skill', special technical know-how. Often μῆτις is used in a less specific way, not so much for special technical skill as for general 'intellect, ingenuity', the ability to make plans, as in the

[24] If the tendencies observed above with respect to the *scope* of τοι apply to *h.l.*, it would be primarily the qualification γλυκεῖαν which is surprising, or the combination of γλυκεῖαν and Μενάνδρου.

passages in the *Iliad* where Odysseus is referred to by the formula Ὀδυςῆα Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον (2.169, 407, 2.636, 10.137; also twice of Hector: 7.47, 11.200; cf. also Odysseus' epithet πολύμητις, *Il.*1.311, etc.); cf. also γυναικῶν | ἀλλάων περίειμι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα μῆτιν, *Od.*19.325/6; κραιπνότερος μὲν γάρ τε νόος, λεπτὴ δέ τε μῆτις, *Il.*23.590 (cf. 10.226).

When μῆτις is used to refer to manifestations of this mental capacity this can either be an advice, a plea, spoken out (τοῖς ὁ γέρων πάμπρωτος ὑφαίνειν ἤρχετο μῆτιν | Νέςτωρ, οὗ καὶ πρόςθεν ἀρίςτη φαίνετο βουλή· | ὅ ςφιν ἐϋφρονέων ἀγορήςατο καὶ μετέειπεν·, *Il.*7.324-6 [= 9.93-5]), or a more abstract 'plan' (ἀλλ' ἄγετ' αὐτοί περ φραζώμεθα μῆτιν ἀρίςτην, *Il.*17.634, 712; ἀλλ' ἄγε μῆτιν ὕφηνον, ὅπως ἀποτείςομαι αὐτούς, *Od.*13.386 [cf. *ibid.* 303]).

It must be observed that μῆτις in itself is neutral with respect to the moral assessment of the 'skill' or 'plans' it refers to. If the context will have it, μῆτις used of mental capacity can refer to 'cunning'.

Cf. esp. ἔνθ' οὔ τίς ποτε μῆτιν ὁμοιωθῆναι ἄντην | ἤθελ', ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὸν ἐνίκα δῖος Ὀδυςςεὺς | παντοίοιςι δόλοιςι, *Od.*3.120.

Consequently, μῆτις can refer to the manifestation of cunning, to wily plans, coming close to δόλος.

Cf. e.g. ἐμὸν δ' ἐγέλαςςε φίλον κῆρ, | ὡς ὄνομ' ἐξαπάτηςεν ἐμὸν καὶ μῆτις ἀμύμων, *Od.*9.413/4, reffering to Odysseus' trick misleading the Cyclops (cf. also *Od.*20.20); cf. also αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ βούλευον, ὅπως ὄχ' ἄριςτα γένοιτο, | εἴ τιν' ἑταίροιςιν θανάτου λύςιν ἠδ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῶι | εὑροίμην· πάντας δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον, | ὥς τε περὶ ψυχῆς· μέγα γὰρ κακὸν ἐγγύθεν ἦεν. | ἥδε δέ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίςτη φαίνετο βουλή, *Od.*9.420-4; ἐπεὶ ςὺ μέν ἐςςι βροτῶν ὄχ' ἄριςτος ἁπάντων | βουλῆι καὶ μύθοιςιν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐν πᾶςι θεοῖςιν | μήτι τε κλέομαι καὶ κέρδεςι, *Od.*13.297-9, Athene speaking to Odysseus. μῆτις can even be used to refer to most immoral plans, as in *Od.*4.678, where it refers to the Suitors' plan to kill Telemachus.

• *Pindar:* In Pindar, too, μῆτις refers to mental capacities or their manifestations.

For the former, cf. μῆτίν τε γαρύων παλαιγόνων | πόλεμόν τ' ἐν ἡρωΐαις ἀρεταῖςιν | οὐ ψεύςομ' ἀμφὶ Κορίνθωι, Cίςυφον μὲν πυκνότατον παλάμαις ὡς θεόν, | καὶ τὰν πατρὸς ἀντία Μήδειαν θεμέναν γάμον αὐτᾶι, | ναΐ ςώτειραν Ἀργοῖ καὶ προπόλοις, *O.*13.50-4, where Sisyphus and Medea are mentioned as examples of persons having μῆτις; Sisyphus is explicitly called πυκνότατος παλάμαις, 'extremely cunning in wits' (perhaps with an allusion to the fact that he got back from death by a trick); Medea's 'cunning' is said to have resulted in the saviour of the Argo and her crew (as the use of μῆτις is by no means confined to morally appraisable cunning, the more picturesque details of Medea's actions, e.g., that she threw chops of her little brothers into the sea in order to retard her father following after her, are not necessarily excluded). μῆτις refers to the combination of technical skill and cunning in *I.*4.47, where the pancratiast (?) Melissus is characterized as μῆτιν δ' ἀλώπηξ.

When Pindar uses μῆτις to refer to manifestations of this mental capacity, he curiously enough limits this usage to prophetic utterances.

Cf. ἦ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων ςτίχες, ἔπταξαν δ' ἀκίνητοι ςιωπᾷ Ι ἥροες ἀντίθεοι πυκινὰν μῆτιν κλύοντες, *P.*4.57/8; ἔνθεν δ' ὔμμι Λατοίδας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον Ι ςὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄςτυ χρυςοθρόνου Ι διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας Ι ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις, *P.*4.259-62; τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανᾷ χλοαρὸν γελάςςαις ὀφρύϊ, μῆτιν ἑὰν Ι εὐθὺς ἀμείβετο, *P.*9.38/9.

Bacchylides does have μῆτις in the sense of 'plan': τότ' ἄμαχος δαίμων Ι Δαϊανείρᾳ πολύδακρυν ὕφανε Ι μῆτιν ἐπίφρον', B.16.23-5. An ἄμαχος δαίμων wove a shrewd plan for Deianira when she heard that Heracles would take home Iole. The poet does not specify what the 'shrewd plan' was. The audience are supposed to remeber from Sophocles that it was her plan to win Heracles back for herself by using the alleged love-spell Nessus gave to her. Both the epithet ἐπίφρων and the reported content of the painful message betray the perspective of Deianira in all her ignorance. The audience are led to see through this and to recognize that the arrival of Iole was in fact not as painful as Deianira supposed and that her plan was not quite as shrewd, not quite as ἐπίφρων, as she might have wished. The effect is that of tragic irony. For more details on this passage, see my 'Bacchylides' Homer, His Tragedy, & His Pindar'. Cf. also ὕφαινέ τε ποταινίαν Ι μῆτιν, B.17.51/2; [ς]ὺ δὲ βαρεῖαν κάτεχε μῆ̣τιν, B.17.28/9.

There is one other passage in Pindar where μῆτις is used in a context dealing with poetical skill: μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάςομεν· Ι ὅθεν ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται Ι ςοφῶν μητίεςςι, *O.*1.7-9. This is, however, a highly complicated and controversial passage, mainly because it is uncertain whether any metaphor is implied by ἀμφιβάλλεται and, if so, which metaphor this could be (see in detail Gerber *ad loc.* [pp. 26-8]). It is clear, however, that the point is that the Olympian Games are the best and that they above all deserve to be celebrated by poets and provide them with inspiration. ςοφοί must refer to 'poets', including Pindar himself. ςοφῶν μητίεςςι is a generic plural expression; each ςοφός has only one μῆτις. So 'the hymn throws itself around the μῆτις of each poet', which means, to my mind, that in the case of Olympia the hymn urges itself to the μῆτις of each poet, that they are almost automatically inspired when they have to sing hymns about Olympia. On the literal level the image is the reline of what we have here: in *O.*1.8/9 the song is said to come to the μῆτις (or, at leat, the song is presented as the agent acting on the μῆτις), while here the song originates from the μῆτις. However, on a metaphorical level the statement in *O.*1.8/9 can be brought into line with *h.l.*, for if Pindar indeed wishes to express that in the case of Olympia poets are automatically inspired, it is effective to reline the real state of afairs and to say that song urges itself to the instance responsible for its production.

Verdenius on *O.*1.9 (II p. 10) suggests that μῆτις here is used "similarly" to ὥς δ' ὁπόταν γραφέες ἀναθήματα ποικίλλωσιν, | ἀνέρες ἀμφὶ[25] τέχνης ὑπὸ μήτιος δεδαῶτε[26], Emp.*fr.*15 (Wright, = 23 DK); but here μῆτις clearly is the general intelligence which has enabled the painters to learn their technical skills, referred to by τέχνη.

For μῆτις in general, or rather for an interpretation of the role played by intellect and intelligence in Greek civilisation, see M. Detienne & J.-P. Vernant, *Les ruses de l'intelligence. La mètis des Grecs*, Paris 1974.

*N.*3.12-13. χαρίεντα δ' ἕξει πόνον | χώρας ἄγαλμα

This sentence is notoriously problematic. The main questions are: (1) What is the subject of ἕξει? (2) What is the reference of the phrase χώρας ἄγαλμα? (3) What is the reference of the *oxymoron* χαρίεντα ... πόνον?

Boeckh takes χώρας ἄγαλμα as the subject of ἕξει and as referring to the chorus ("pulcrum elegantemque laborem habebit chorus"). Matthiae also takes χώρας ἄγαλμα as the subject of ἕξει, but explains it as referring to the ode. Mezger (*ad loc.*, p. 386) takes ὕμνος from line 11, referred to by μιν in 11, as the subject of ἕξει and χώρας ἄγαλμα as an apposition to χαρίεντα πόνον ("es wird als liebliche Arbeit haben, den Schmuck des Landes"). Thus also Bury (*ad loc.*, p. 47: "Its gracious work will be a bright jewel to deck the land"), Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 28)[27] and Farnell *ad loc.* ("the hymn will have a pleasant task, the glorification of the land", II p. 255). Dissen and Hermann understood Zeus as the subject of ἕξει and took χαρίεντα as predicate ("lubens autem accipiet hoc carmen Iuppiter utpote ornamentum terrae"); they are followed, recently, by Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 16, n. 16, and in his note *ad loc.* (*Selected Odes*, p. 156). The conjectures changing ἕξει into a second person (ἕξεις, Rauchenstein, Heyne; ἕξεαι, Mommsen) or into a first person (ἕξω, Paley) are meant to avoid the problem with respect to the identification of the subject.

(1) If we survey the possibilities with respect to the identification of the subject, the interpretation taking Zeus as the subject of ἕξει (Dissen, Hermann, Instone) is to be excluded. The reference to Zeus in line 10 is a mere attributive to θύγατερ (see above) and Zeus cannot be supposed to be so prominently present as an *agens* in the conciousness of the audience to justify this interpretation.[28] The subject of ἕξει must be χώρας ἄγαλμα. This constituent can be interpreted as a nominative and must therefore be subject, since no other

---

[25] Ald.: ἄμφω codd.

[26] δεδαῶτες *v.l.*; on the dual see Wright *ad loc.*

[27] "Here it might be said that ὕμνος is the subject, χώρας ἄγαλμα being in apposition, and ἕξει = 'will involve' " (*loc. cit.*). Or does Fennell mean to take χώρας ἄγαλμα as an apposition to ὕμνος?

[28] Thus Willcock cited by Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 16 n. 16. This objection against Zeus being the subject has nothing to do with punctuation (*pace* Instone himself).

constitient is available to perform this function. It is unnatural to interpret ἄγαλμα as an accusative, being an apposition to πόνον, and to supply an other constituent from the context as the subject (Mezger, Bury, Fennell?, Farnell). It is even less plausible to interpret ἄγαλμα as a nominative and not to take it as the subject, but as an apposition to a supplied subject (Fennell?).

(2) **χώρας ἄγαλμα** means 'the outward show of the country's honour,' referring to this ode, which is being sung already but whose performance is pretended to be a future event (ἕξει, see general note on the proem). This ode is the concrete representation of the honour the victor has won by winning at the Games, which was considered to be an honour for the entire country.[29]

ἄγαλμα is a concrete representation of 'glory,' 'honour.' An ἄγαλμα is both honouring and ornamental; it refers to outward show of a person's status. Thus it may refer, e.g., to a statue (*N.*5.1, see my note, p. 101) or to a monument (*N.*10.67, of a tombstone). Gifts can also be referred to by ἄγαλμα, for they symbolize and visualize the giver's acknowledgement of the receiver's status (*Od.*4.603, 18.301, 3.438, 8.509). In φέρων | Λυδίαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν, | Δείνιος δισσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα, *N.*8.14-6, ἄγαλμα is interpreted by the scholiast as τὸν ποικίλον ὕμνον. ἄγαλμα is also used with reference to an ode in εὔμοιρε [C]υρακ[οσίω]ν ἱπποδινήτων στρατα[γ]έ, | γνώσηι μὲν [ἰ]οστεφάνων Μοισᾶν γλυκ[ύ]δωρον ἄγαλμα, B.5.1-4. Cf. also ἀθάνατον Μουσᾶν ἄγαλμα, B.10.11; ὁρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν] | χρύσεον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρωι πτερόν | καὶ συμποσ[ίαι]σιν ἄγαλμ' [ἐν] εἰκάδεσ[σιν], B.*fr.*20b.3-5. In ἀρετὰ δ' ἐπίμοχθος [μέν, τ]ελευταθεῖσα δ' ὀρθῶς | [ἀνδρὶ κ]αὶ εὖτε θάνηι λείπ[ει πολυ]ζήλωτον εὐκλείας ἄ[γαλ]μα, B.1.181-4, the concrete representation in which the ἄγαλμα consists is unspecified.

Boeckh's interpretation of χώρας ἄγαλμα as referring to the chorus performing this ode implies that ἄγαλμα is interpreted metaphorically, as referring to the performers, the chorus of young Aeginetans, who would, with this interpretation, be said to be the 'honour of their country.' This metaphorical usage is paralleled by A.*Ag.*208, where a τέκνον is called δόμων ἄγαλμα. Cf. also τί γὰρ πατρὸς θάλλοντος εὐκλείας τέκνοις | ἄγαλμα μεῖζον ἢ τί πρὸς παίδων πατρί; S.*Ant.*703/4. For our passage here, however, the metaphorical interpretation of ἄγαλμα is unlikely. A word is used metaphorically when the denotation of that word does not make sense in the context and when the choice for this word is motivated by the relevance of its connotations. According to the well-known 'cooperative principle' described by H.P. Grice,[30] a recipient is going to test the possibility

---

[29] For Pindar the link between a victory at the Great Games and the good of the community is obvious and unquestionable. See comm. on *N.*5.8 ἐγέραιρεν.

[30] H.P. Grice, 'Logic and Conversation', *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (P. Cole & J.L. Morgan, edd.), New York 1975, 41-58. In the case of metaphor we are dealing mainly with Grice's 'maxim of relation', i.e. the assumption that

whether a word might be used metaphorically only if the literal interpretation of the word is irrelevant in the context. As it appears from the passages quoted above, the denotation of ἄγαλμα is a 'concrete representation of a man's glory, honour.' It refers to outward show of a person's status and in epinician contexts it is used preeminently to refer to concrete representations of the honour of a victory, such as a statue or a victory ode. So if this literal interpretation of ἄγαλμα makes sense here, a metaphorical interpretation of this noun is excluded.

(3) It is not immediately clear what the *oxymoron* **χαρίεντα πόνον** refers to. The phrase πόνον ἔχειν, with a personal subject, is an idiomatic expression for 'suffering, having trouble'.

Cf. Τρώων, οἳ ἔχουϲι πολὺν πόνον εἵνεκα ϲεῖο, *Il.*6.525 (Hector speaking to Paris); ἀτὰρ οὔ τιν' ἔχει πόνον, ἀλλὰ ἕκηλοϲ | ἧϲται ἐν 'Ατρεΐδαο δόμοιϲ, *Od.*13.423/4 (Athena reassuring Odysseus about Telemachus; ἔχει πόνον rephrazes Odysseus' ἄλγεα πάϲχῃ, 418); *Il.*5.67, *Il.*15.416, Hes.*Th.*629, Hes.*Sc.*310 (cf. also 305); ὃϲ δὲ μυρία μὲν ἀμφιπολεῖ φρενί, | τὸ δὲ παρ' ἆμάρ τε ⟨καὶ⟩ νύκτα μελλόντων | χάριν αἰὲν ἰάπτεται κέαρ, ἄκαρπον ἔχει πόνον, B.*fr.*11.3-7, he exerts himself in vain, as in: οὐκ ἔϲτιν οὐδὲν χωρὶϲ ἀνθρώποιϲ θεῶν· | ϲπουδάζομεν δὲ πόλλ' ὑπ' ἐλπίδων, μάτην | πόνουϲ ἔχοντεϲ, οὐδὲν εἰδότεϲ ϲαφέϲ, E.*fr.*391 (Thyestes). Cf. also Simon.*fr.*38.1.7, Hdt. 2.14, 6.108, E.*Cycl.*1, *Ion* 631, *Troad.*1198, *El.*65, etc.

Here, however, πόνον ἕξει has an impersonal subject, which cannot possibly 'suffer' itself.[31] Here πόνον ἕξει must mean 'will involve labour,' as in: ὅμωϲ δ' ὅτι τὸ ϲφήκωμ' ἔχει πόνον πολύν, | δοίην ἂν αὐτοῖν ἰϲχάδων τρεῖϲ χοίνικαϲ, Ar.*Pax* 1216/7, 'as (the fabrication of) a ϲφήκωμα involves much labour (for the helmet-maker), I would be prepared to offer (him) three rations of dried fig.' Similarly, πόνον here must refer to the poet's 'labour' in manufacturing this χώραϲ ἄγαλμα, this ode. But it is a πόνοϲ that is χαρίειϲ, a task that is pleasant and that will be gladly undertaken by the poet. So the *oxymoron* χαρίεντα πόνον refers to the 'pleasant labour' on the part of the poet, consisting in creating this 'monument for the country.'

The associations evoked by ἄγαλμα contribute to this interpretation. As an ἄγαλμα is pre-eminently something large and troublesome to make, like a statue or a monument, the choice of this particular noun to refer to the ode is illustrative of the fact that its creation involves labour.

---

what the speaker says is relevant and that the hearer assumes that what the speaker says is relevant.

[31] This does not apply to the only Pindaric example of πόνον ἔχειν with an impersonal subject: ἅτε γὰρ ἐννάλιον πόνον ἐχοίϲαϲ βαθὺν | ϲκευᾶϲ ἑτέραϲ, ἀβάπτιϲτοϲ εἶμι φελλὸϲ ὣϲ ὑπὲρ ἕρκοϲ ἅλμαϲ, *P.*2.79/80, which must mean that 'the rest of the gear' is involved in catching fish, deep down, while the poet keeps floating at the surface like a cork. In this passage the ἑτέρα ϲκευά, just like the φελλόϲ, stand for a person, which accounts for πόνον ἐχοίϲαϲ having to be interpreted as having a personal subject.

For the poet presenting his task as a 'burden', which he will willingly bear, cf. ἑκόντι δ' ἐγὼ νώτωι μεθέπων δίδυμον ἄχθος | ἄγγελος ἔβαν, *N.*6.57. For the poet's willingness to praise the victor, see my note on *P.*8.67 (p. 555). For πόνος referring to the poet's tasks, cf. ἐμοὶ δὲ τοῦτο[ν δ]ιέδω[καν] ἀθάνατ[ο]ν πόνον[32], *Pae.*7b.21/2, *sc.* the Muses, the πόνος being βαθεῖαν ἐρευνᾶν σοφίας ὁδόν; πόνοι χορῶν [|]εες τ' ἀοιδαί, *fr.*70c16/7. **χαρίεις** serves to associate the noun it qualifies with the notion χάρις. The usage of χάρις can be devided into two categories: In the first place, χάρις, being cognate to χαίρω, is conveniantly defined as 'something giving pleasure.'[33] All instances, traditionally translated with words like 'splendour, honour, lustre, glory, favour, blessing, gift, charm, or beauty', belong to this category, and it is the context, not the word itself, that is responsible for us preferring one of these translations to any other. The second category consists of those instances where χάρις means 'the act of showing pleasure' and where it is traditionally translated with 'gratitude' (see also comm. *ad N.*5.54 Χάρισσιν, p. 193). When πόνος here is associated with χάρις, the πόνος is said to give pleasure. A similar *oxymoron* occurs in: 'Ασίας ἀπὸ γᾶς | ἱερὸν Τμῶλον ἀμείψασα θοάζω | Βρομίωι πόνον ἡδὺν | κάματόν τ' εὐκάματον, Βάκχιον εὐαζομένα, E.*Ba.*64-7 (cf. also *Ion* 131-5); ἀπὸ γυμνασίοιο καλὸν πόνον ἄρτι λιπόντων, Theoc.2.80. For the form **ἕξει**, cf. ἕξειν, B.13.163; ἕξεις, Thgn.336, 558, 1304, 1332. Pindar uses σχήσει in *fr.*52v.17, 232 (codd.: ἔσχε Schroeder) and σχήσοι in *P.*9.116 (σχήσει *v.l.*).

*N.*3.14. ἀγοράν

• *Metrical considerations:* All mss. read παλαίφατον ἀγοράν. The problem with this reading is that it entails a non-responding resolution of the *longum* of a double short element (... ⏑—⏑⏑⏗—‖). If this occurred in the choral section of a tragedy no one would even scratch one's head, but Pindar is known to be a remarkably strict responder.[34] However, non-responding resolutions of a single-short element can be parallelled by quite a few instances (*O.*10.70,[35] *O.*13.69, 91, 112, *P.*1.17, *P.*5.2, 25, 29, 31, 91, *P.*9.25, *N.*5.10, *I.*3/4.72b, *I.*6.63, *I.*8.52). Non-responding resolution of the *longum* of a double-short element is admittedly more unusual, since it results in four short syllables in a row, but this can be parallelled by *Pae.*6.176 (both corresponding lines [epode 10] have been preserved), *Pae.*6.149 (= Γ antistr. 4, the corresponding Γ str. 4 has been preserved, but A antistr. 4 and B str. 4 are missing); *N.*7.70 and *O.*10.105 are other examples, but with proper names; *I.*8.56 is doubious; *Pae.*6.131 could also be

[32] *v.l.* πόρον.
[33] While χάρμα is the 'joy, pleasure' itself.
[34] See Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, p. 156 (IV 6.5.1. [3]).
[35] Unless the reading of the mss. is maintained and interpreted as ἀλιρροθίου.
[36] Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 255; thus also Wilamowitz, *Pindar*, p. 277 n. 2) explains

an example, but the corresponding antistrophe is mutilated. Apart from these parallels, it must be observed that the effect of the resolution here in *N*.3 is in keeping with the metrical form of the entire poem: four short syllables in a row are a 'theme' (see my metrical analysis pp. 234-40); a similar resolution at the end of ep. 4 (... —⏑⏖⏑—||) occurs only in the last two triads. The metrical irregularity is not in itself sufficient reason to condemn the unanimous mss. reading.

• *Semantic considerations:* ἀγορά means 'public assembly,' or may be used to refer to the place where such assemblies take place.

For 'assembly,' cf. λαιψηροὶ πόλεμοι | κἀγοραὶ βουλαφόροι, *O.*12.4/5; *Od.*9.112, *Od.*2.68/9, *Il.*8.2, etc. For 'gathering-place,' cf. κτίσεν ... | ἀλεξιμβρότοις πεδιάδα πομπαῖς | ἔμμεν ἱππόκροτον | σκυρωτὰν ὁδόν, ἔνθα πρυμνοῖς ἀγορᾶς ἔπι δίχα κεῖται θανών, *P.*5.89-93; θεοί, | πολύβατον οἵ τ' ἄστεος ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντ' ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀθάναις | οἰχνεῖτε πανδαίδαλόν τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν, *fr.*75.2-5 (cf. Th.6.54.6); ἔνθα κάρυκες δι' εὐρεῖαν πόλιν ὀρνύμενοι | Τρώων ἀόλλιζον φάλαγγας | δεξίστρατον εἰς ἀγοράν, B.15.40-3; *Il.*7.382; S.*OT* 20, 160, *Trach.*372 (see Jebb *ad loc.*), 424, 638, etc.

Unless one is prepared to assume that there was in Aegina a Μυρμιδόνων Ἀγορά,[36] for which there is no evidence, it is quite surprising that Pindar refers to an 'assembly' of the Myrmidons, who were in epic tradition primarily known for their fighting abilities.[37] An association of the Myrmidons with political activity is strange, especially since the παλαίφατον quality of the Myrmidons is referred to in order to parallel Aristoclidas' pancration victory.

Recently Instone (*Eranos* 91, 1993, 17; thus also in his note *ad loc.*, *Selected Odes*, p. 156) suggested that "Aristokleides, by winning, enhanced what was said in the agora: by winning he occasioned from others, as in the agora they discussed his performance, not rebukes but words of praise." Thus ἀγορὰν | οὐκ ... | ἐμίανε would stand for 'he did not cause tainting words to be uttered by those talking about him in the agora'; compression indeed.[38]

---

the phrase as "the name of the locality where Aristokleidas dwelt, or more generally as describing the city or the island of Aigina, 'the gathering-place or folkmoot of the Myrmidons'." Cf. also Bury (*ad loc.*, p. 47), "Aristoclides brought no soil of shame on the Place of Assembly called after the Myrmidons".

[37] Cf. e.g. *Il.*16.65, 23.5, 129, 19.278, *Od.*3.188. Also in the only other Pindar mentioning of the Myrmidons, at *Pae.*6.108.

[38] The idea that people talk about the victor's accomplishments in the agora is, of course, in itself not inconceivable. One would only wish it to be expressed when meant. It must be observed that this idea is not confirmed by *P.*4.83-94, as Instone believes: the people talk about Jason in the agora because he happens to be in the agora.

[39] Bury, pp. 47/8; Fraccaroli, p. 299, n. 4; Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, p. 154.

Pindar's choice of the noun ἀγορά here can be understood if one combines the legendary martial qualities of the Myrmidons with the following three observations: (1) Aristoclidas' victory had a political dimension; (2) there is evidence for the association of the Myrmidons with political activity; (3) there is some evidence in support of the assumption that an ἀγορά was the place where the Myrmidons would have held their Games.

(1) As the ἀγορά was pre-eminently the place where public life took place, the noun in itself evokes associations with political activity (cf. esp. *O.*12.5). Some scholars have rightly connected ἀγορά here with lines 69/70, where Aristoclidas is said to have added Apollo's Thearion to his concerns.[39] Apparently, Aristoclidas' victory has a political dimension to it, which helps to understand Pindar's choice of the noun here. Thus the reference to the 'Myrmidons' agora' is an economical means of at the same time suggesting a parallel between Aristoclidas' pancration victory and the famous race of warriors and bringing out the political dimensions of his victory.

As I will argue below, the phrasing of 69/70 suggests that his membership was a direct effect of his present victory. If I am right, the at first sight surprising statement, that Aristoclidas' victory enhanced the glory of Aeginetan public life, has great poignancy, since it would then convey the highly complimentary suggestion that Aristoclidas' victory is a tribute to public life, because his victory results in his going to partake in public life. The tendency towards ring composition in this ode may be adduced as an additional argument for connecting ἀγοράν here with lines 69/70.

(2) Carnes, *CW* 84, 1990, 41-4, referring to Plin.*NH* 11.108 and Lucian.*Icaromenippus* 19, explained the association of the Myrmidons with political activity by suggesting that the Myrmidons are presented here as having retained their original ant-like qualities.[40] These sources are pretty late. But if we accept them as explaining an association between the Myrmidons and political activity, Pindar's choice of the noun here, motivated by the political dimension of Aristoclidas' victory, gains additional pregnancy. Then the reference to the 'Myrmidons' agora' would be an even more economical means of at the same time suggesting a parallel between Aristoclidas'

---

[40] The political activities of ants and those of the Myrmidons are explicitly connected by Theogenes (*FHG* IV 511), quoted by the Σ. *ad* line 13/4 (21, III 45/6 Dr.): μεθ' ὧν (*sc.* Μυρμιδόνων) cυνοικίcαντα τὸν Αἰακὸν τοὺc ἐκ Πελοποννήcου μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ παραγενομένουc, ἐξημερῶcαί τε καὶ νόμουc δοῦναι καὶ cύνταξιν πολιτικὴν, ἧι χρηcαμένουc αὐτοὺc παντελῶc δοκεῖν ἐκ μυρμήκων γενέcθαι.

[41] Ἕδρα may be used with the same sense as ἀγορά, cf. εἶδεν δ' εὔκυκλον

pancration victory and the famous race of warriors and bringing out the political dimensions of his victory, while suggesting a parallel between Aristoclidas' public function and similar qualities of that ancient race.

(3) Dissen (*ad loc.*, p. 378) explains ἀγορά here as: "hic est de conventu ludicro," referring to: ἦρχε δὲ τῶι αὐτὴν ὁδόν, ἥν περ οἱ ἄλλοι | Φαιήκων οἱ ἄριστοι, ἀέθλια θαυμανέοντες. | βὰν δ' ἴμεν εἰς ἀγορήν, ἅμα δ' ἕσπετο πουλὺς ὅμιλος, *Od.*8.107-9; cf. 156. I do not believe that there is evidence for following Dissen and taking ἀγορά here to *mean* 'meeting for games' as LSJ render it for *h.l.* There is no other occurrence of the noun for this usage. Nonetheless, the *Odyssey* passages are helpful in that they prove that the Phaeacians held their Games in their ἀγορά. It is not *a priori* impossible that Pindar has used the 'historically correct' reference to the place where the Myrmidons held their games, thus presenting Aristoclidas' victory as a continuation of the athletic exploits of his ancestors. Admittedly, this interpretation has two problems. First, the Myrmidons are not primarily known for their athletic capacities. Second, it is unlikely that the noun ἀγορά in itself evokes connotations with athletics, a problem that is even more pressing in the light of the first observation. However, considering the not uncommon merging of athletics and war, it seems not entirely inconceivable that the Myrmidons are naturally regarded as great athletes because of their martial qualities. The fact that their race is adduced here in order to parallel Aristoclidas' pancration victory surely helps to make this *ad hoc* association. In support of the association of ἀγορά and ἀγών it can be observed that in early Greek the nouns ἀγορά and ἀγών are partly synonymous.

ἀγών, like ἀγορά, refers to a 'gathering' in: θεῶν δ' ἕδος ἁγνὸς Ὄλυμπος· | ἐν δ' ἀγορῆ, περὶ δ' ὄλβος ἀπείριτος ἐστεφάνωτο | ἀθανάτων ἐν ἀγῶνι, Hes.*Sc.*203-5; αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος | Τρῶας ἐυφρανέω καὶ Τρωιάδας ἑλκεσιπέπλους, | αἵ τέ μοι εὐχόμεναι θεῖον δύσονται ἀγῶνα, *Il.*7.296-8; cf. *Il.*18.376. ἀγών refers to a 'gathering place' in: ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] | γλῶσσα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν [καταχεῦαι] | ἀγῶνα Λοξία{ι} καταβάντ' εὐρὺν | ἐν θεῶν ξενίαι, *Pae.*6.58-61 (with Radt, *Zweiter und Sechster Paian*, p. 41); ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰών ⟨κεν⟩ εὕροις | ἐς 'Θπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν, *P.*10.29/30. Eusth. on *Il.*24.1/2 (p. 1335.56-8) records that the Boeotians called an agora ἀγών: παρὰ δὲ Βοιωτοῖς ἀγὼν κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ἡ ἀγορά· ὅθεν καὶ ἀγορανόμος ὁ ἀγωνάρχης, καὶ παρ' Αἰσχύλωι "ἀγώνιοι θεοί" (A.*Ag.*513, see Fraenkel *ad loc.*) οἱ ἀγοραῖοι. The ἀγών is especially the place where Games are being held: ἔλπομαι | μὴ χαλκοπάραον ἄκονθ' ὡσεἰτ' ἀγῶνος βαλεῖν ἔξω, *P.*1.43/4; ἔστασεν γὰρ ἅπαντα χορὸν | ἐν τέρμασιν αὐτίκ' ἀγῶνος· | σὺν δ' ἀέθλοις ἐκέλευσεν διακρῖναι ποδῶν, *P.*9.114/5; cf. *Il.*23.273, 448, 451, 495, 507, 513, 617, 654, 685, 696, 710, 799, 847,

886, *Od.*8.200, 238, 259/60, 380, Hes.*Sc.*312, Th.5.50. The specialisations of both nouns, ἀγορά getting the meaning 'gathering (place)' for economical and political purposes, ἀγών referring to an 'assembly' of the Greeks at their national games, are only in post-pindaric times fully realized.

In sum, ἀγοράν here is far from unproblematic, but there are ways of explaining it. In the first place, and at the most basic level, Aristoclidas' pancration victory is said not to be a disgrace to the Myrmidons, his legendary ancestors, who were very famous for their martial skills. The Myrmidons always operate collectively, which makes it understandable that they are referred to as the 'gathered' Myrmidons; this presentation involves a great compliment to the victor, as he alone matches the gathered forces of these famous warriors. Why, then, does Pindar use ἀγορά instead of some more common noun for 'host, folk-moot'? The noun ἀγορά evokes strong associations with public life. These are relevant, since (1) Aristoclidas' victory had a political dimension, witnessing lines 69/70 below; (2) the association of the Myrmidons with political activity can be accounted for, though, admittedly, the sources are late; (3) the agora was, in the days of the Myrmidons, a place where Games took place, so that the choice of the noun may be motivated by the wish on the part of the poet to open the door to an interpretation that Aristoclidas' victory enhanced the glory of the Myrmidons' athletic accomplishments.

Both the metrical and the semantic difficulties of ἀγοράν have led scholars to altering the text. Several conjectures have been suggested: ἕδραν[41], C.L. Kayser, *Jahrbücher der Literatur*, 105, 1844, 108; ἀλκάν[42] *vel* ὁρμάν[43], R. Rauchenstein, *Philologus* 13, 1858, 250; ὀργάν[44], E. Boehmer, *Pindars sicilische Oden nebst den epizephyrischen*, Bonn 1891, p. VIII; ἑcμόν[45], O. Schroeder, *Pindari Carmina*, Lipsiae 1900; ἄγραν[46] Hutchinson, *Essays and*

ἕδραν, | τὰν οὐρανοῦ βαcιλῆεc πόντου τ' ἐφεζόμενοι | δῶρα καὶ κράτοc ἐξέφαναν ἐγγενὲc αὐτῶι, *N.*4.66-8. This provides some likeliness to the presupposition that ἀγορά was an explaining note to ἕδρα that later got into the text.

[42] Cf. *O.*9.11, 10.100, *P.*4.173, 9.35, *N.*2.14, *I.*5.11.

[43] This conjecture I do not understand. Μυρμιδόνων ὅρμαν must mean something like 'the Myrmidons' rapid motion forwards', i.e. 'the onrush, the attack of the Myrmidons', or 'the effort of the Myrmidons'. See comm. *ad N.*5.20. This makes no sense in this context.

[44] Cf. ἐν Οἰνώναι μεγαλήτορεc ὀργαὶ | Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε, *I.*5.34/5.

[45] The fact that ἑcμόc is mainly used to refer to a swarm of insects, especially bees (Hdt.5.114, Pl.*Lg.*708b, X.*HG* 3.2.28), and can be used metaphorically to refer to a 'swarm' of men (A.*Supp.*30, 223; cf. also Ar.*Lys.*353), makes this conjecture very attractive in the case of the Myrmidons.

[46] Hutchinson whishes to interpret ἄγραν as referring metaphorically to Aegina: "it would then be a felicious touch to call that country the 'quarry', 'hunting-spoil' of his race (cf. ἄγρα δορὸc said of Thebes, A.*Th.*322) if the latter were conquering immigrants" (p. 226). Moreover, he refers to the 'hunting motif', run-

Studies, 226/7; αἴγλαν[47], J. Sitzler, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 32, 1915, 387; ἄκραν[48], L. Bornemann, *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 216, 1928, 134.

The best conjecture by far is εἴραν, proposed by H. Stadtmüller, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 1902, 104, and by A.W. Mair (in Bowra's edition). The presupposition is that ἀγοράν was a marginal glosse to εἴραν which slipped into the text. This is confirmed by the *E.M. s.v.* εἴρα, where it is paraphrased as ἀγορά, and by the scholia on *Il.*18.531 (see below). This conjecture restores the responsion. The noun εἴρα occurs twice in Greek literature. In δεκάτωι δ' ἐπιμίςγεται αὖτις | εἴρας ἐς[49] ἀθανάτων, οἳ Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουςιν, Hes.*Th.*803/4, the phrase ἐπιμίςγεται αὖτις | εἴρας ἐς ἀθανάτων clearly rephrazes ἐς βουλὴν ἐπιμίςγεται (802). In οἳ δ' ὡς οὖν ἐπύθοντο πολὺν κέλαδον παρὰ βουςὶν | εἰράων[50] προπάροιθε καθήμενοι, *Il.*18.530/1, its sense is unclear. It could refer to the gathered forces besieging the city (the ones 'sitting in front of them' then being guards or the like), but we cannot be certain. The scholia simply paraphrase it as ἀγορά, ἐκκληςία[51]. All this makes the presupposed corruption easy to account for; it is, however, highly questionable whether εἴραν evokes the same strong connotations with public life as ἀγοράν does. And these connotations are exactly what makes ἀγοράν functional here.

*N.*3.15. ἐλεγχέεςςιν

Epic diction has the verb ἐλέγχω, the nouns τὸ ἔλεγχος and ἡ ἐλεγχείη, and the adjective ἐλεγχής. The underlying idea in Homer is described by Adkins, *Moral Values and Political Behaviour*, p. 12, as denoting and decrying "the condition of an *agathos* who has behaved like a *kakos* and done something *aischron*, or—since Homeric society is a 'shame culture'—is conscious that his fellows believe him to have acted in this manner,"[52] In Homer ἔλεγχος is exclusively used in the sense 'refutation' of the expectancies people have of an ἀγαθός based on him being ἀγαθός, i.e., 'disgrace' experienced by failure.

Cf., e.g., ἀλλ' ἄγε δεῦρο, πέπον, παρ' ἔμ' ἵςταςο· δὴ γὰρ ἔλεγχος | ἔςςεται, εἴ κεν νῆας ἕλῃι κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ, *Il.*11.314/5; *Il.*4.169-75, *Il.*22.99/100, *Od.*21.324-9. Cf also the term of abuse for men κακ' ἐλέγχεα (*Il.*2.235, 5.787, 8.228, Hes.*Th.*26). For the verb, cf. *Il.*9.522, *Od.*21.424.

---

ning through this ode and to the 'echo' of ἄγραν in line 81.

[47] Cf. *O.*13.36, *P.*3.73.

[48] Cf. *h.l.* line 27.

[49] εἰρέας codd.: corr. Hermann: εἴραις Ruhnken. See West *ad loc.* (p. 377).

[50] ἱράων *v.l.*

[51] Scholia vetera: (a. Ariston.) ὅτι εἴρας λέγει τὰς ἀγοράς, cχηματίζων ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴρειν, ὅ ἐςτι λέγειν. (b.) τῶν βουλευτηρίων. Scholia recentiora (Theod.): εἴρην ὄνομα ἡλικίας, παρὰ τὸ εἴρειν καὶ λέγειν, ὁ ἤδη λέγων καὶ δημηγορῶν· καὶ γὰρ τὰς ἐκκληςίας εἴρας προςηγόρευον. (bis) πρὸ τῶν ἀγορῶν, ὅ ἐςτιν ἐκκληςιῶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴρειν ἐν αὐταῖς καὶ λέγειν, ὅθεν καὶ Ἶρις.

[52] See also *Merit and Responsibility*, p. 34.

After Homer and Hesiod the verb ἐλέγχω gets a wider application. The verb becomes to mean 'to bring to the proof' and is used to refer to both possible outcomes of an objective test, 'falsify, refute' as well as 'justify, confirm.'

Cf. ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετὰν coφία τε | παγκρατὴc τ' ἐλέγχει | ἀλάθεια, B.*fr.*14.3-5; Hdt.2.22, Thgn.499-502 (as it quoted by Stob.3.18.14-6). Contast: χαλεπόν γέ cε ἐλέγχαι, ὦ Cώκρατεc· ἀλλ' οὐχὶ κἂν παῖc cε ἐλέγχειεν ὅτι οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγειc; Pl.*Grg.*470c, etc.

By this time, the noun τὸ ἔλεγχοc disappears (as well as ἡ ἐλεγχείη and ἐλεγχήc) and a new noun, ὁ ἔλεγχοc is used, in keeping with the new meaning of the verb. ὁ ἔλεγχοc is the 'proof', the result of an objective test either justifying or falsifying an expectancy or opinion.

Cf. ὁ περὶ τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ λέξαc ἐc ἀφανὲc τὸν μῦθον ἀνενείκαc οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεγχον, Hdt.2.23, it is not possible objectively either to justify or to fasify the theory that the Nile springs from Oceanus, for this explanation takes its refuge into the vague realms of myth; ἀνθ' ὧν μ' Ἐτεοκλῆc, ὧν φύcει νεώτεροc, | γῆc ἐξέωcεν, οὔτε νικήcαc λόγωι | οὔτ' εἰc ἔλεγχον χειρὸc οὐδ' ἔργου μολών, | πόλιν δὲ πείcαc, S.*OC* 1295-8, Eteocles thrust Polynices from the land and won over Thebes, without defeating him in an argument upon his claim and without trying to get objective proof of the rightness of his claim (of his superiority) by beating Polynices in single combat; καὶ τῶνδ' ἔλεγχον τοῦτο μὲν Πυθώδ' ἰὼν | πεύθου τὰ χρηcθέντ', εἰ caφῶc ἤγγειλά cοι, S.*OT* 603/4; καὐτὸc ὢν νέοc ποτὲ | γλῶccαν μὲν ἀργόν, χεῖρα δ' εἶχον ἐργάτιν· | νῦν δ' εἰc ἔλεγχον ἐξιὼν ὁρῶ βροτοῖc | τὴν γλῶccαν, οὐχὶ τἄργα, πάνθ' ἡγουμένην, S.*Ph.*96-9, "but now, when I come forth to the proof, ...", Jebb[53]; τοῦ δὲ μηδιcμοῦ τοῦ Παυcανίου οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρέcβειc πέμψαντεc παρὰ τοὺc Ἀθηναίουc ξυνεπῃτιῶντο καὶ τὸν ΘεμιcτοκλέΑ, ὡc ηὕριcκον ἐκ τῶν περὶ Παυcανίαν ἐλέγχων, ἠξίουν τε τοῖc αὐτοῖc κολάζεcθαι αὐτόν, Th.1.135, 'the evidence on which Pausanias was convicted.'

Pindar uses the verb ἐλέγχω once: τὰ μὲν {ἐν} ἅρμαcι καλλίνικοι πάλαι | Ὀλυμπίαι τ' ἀγώνων πολυφάτων | ἔcχον θοὰν ἀκτῖνα cὺν ἵπποιc, | Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ cτάδιον καταβάντεc ἤλεγξαν | Ἑλλανίδα cτρατιὰν ὠκύτατι, *P.*11.46-50. The usage of this verb gives a curiously Homeric impression,[54] since it may be said that the victors 'refuted' the reputations of their opponents, that they 'disgraced' them by being faster than they were (this is much stronger than to interpret that the victors 'brought their Greek opponents to proof by means of their speed,' which is a rather cryptic way of formulating that they were victorious, liable to misunderstanding).

Pindar uses the noun ὁ ἔλεγχοc twice, in a way that is in keeping with the contemporary material: νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βαcάνωι |

[53] The objective value of the ἔλεγχοc accounts for the use of ὁρῶ.
[54] See also Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, pp. 158/9.

ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος, *N.*8.20/1, where the βάσανος symbolizes the objective test, resulting in ἔλεγχος, certain proof, unambiguously telling whether the νεαρά are good or bad. Cf. also οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω | λόγον· διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος· | ἅπερ Κλυμένοιο παῖδα | Λαμνιάδων γυναικῶν ἔλυσεν ἐξ ἀτιμίας. | χαλκέοισι δ' ἐν ἔντεσι νικῶν δρόμον κτλ, *O.*4.17-22. See further my note on lines 70/1 below (pp. 582/3).

*N.*3.15-16. γ' ἐὰν | ... κατ' αἶσαν

• *Constitution of the text:* The mss. unanimously read τεὰν ... κατ' αἶσαν. This second person pronoun can only refer to the Muse. However, from a pragmatic point of view, addressing her at this satge is rather awkward. She has been addressed for the last time in line 10, and the emphatic shift of perspective from the Muse to the poet himself in line 11 does not help the hearer in perceiving an address to her here. More importantly, an address to the Muse does not make sense in the present context. If τεάν refers to the Muse, the phrase τεὰν ... κατ' αἶσαν must be interpreted as equivalent to expressions like Διὸς αἴσαι and rendered as 'by your ordinance Aristoclides has not sullied the Myrmidons' folk-moot with disgrace by being weak in the pancration.'[55]

The expressions Διὸς αἴσαι and (σὺν) θεῶν αἴσαι are reminiscent of comparable expressions in Homer (e.g. *Il.*9.608, *Od.*9.52, 11.61, etc.), which are usually rendered with 'by the will, ordinance of the god(s)'. Cf. φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας | ἄστει γλῶσσαν, ἵν' αἰολοβρέντα Διὸς αἴσαι | Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε Παρνασσοῦ καταβάντε | δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, *O.*9.41-4; κλεινὰ δὲ καὶ ναυσικλυτὸς Αἴγινα· σὺν θεῶν δέ νιν αἴσαι | Ὕλλου τε καὶ Αἰγιμιοῦ | Δωριεὺς ἐλθὼν στρατὸς | ἐκτίσσατο, *I.*9.1-4; ἦλθέ τοι | Νεμέας ἐξ ἐρατῶν ἀέθλων | παῖς ἐναγώνιος, ὃς ταύταν μεθέπων Διόθεν αἶσαν | νῦν {τε} πέφανται | οὐκ ἄμμορος ἀμφὶ πάλαι κυναγέτας, *N.*6.11-4. Cf. also ἡμετέρη δὲ πόλις κατὰ μὲν Διὸς οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται | αἶσαν καὶ μακάρων θεῶν φρένας ἀθανάτων, Sol.4.1/2 W.

The main problem with this interpretation is, however, as Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 255) rightly observed, that the Muse is nowhere else said to have patronage over the games. Her job starts after the prize has been won and it is very unlikely that she can be said to be responsible for the victory itself. Farnell refers to Κλεοῦς ἐθελοίσας in line 83 of this ode, but it is not true that there "the victories of Aristokleidas are regarded as due to her dispensation or her will," for Κλεοῦς

---

[55] Thus, more or less, Fennell *ad loc.* (p. 29): "Now τεὰν κατ' αἶσαν simply gives us a theological aspect of κατ' αἶσαν, 'duly', with a particular divinity specified. No other explanation is scientific. Render 'as is acceptable in thy sight'. The Muse of glory is the αἰσυμνῆτις who prescribes and approves the conduct and achievements of aspirants to glory."

ἐθελοίcας confines τίν γε μέν ... ἀελοφόρου λήματος ἕνεκεν | Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος, which has reference to the spreading of the victor's fame, the Muse's province *par excellance.*

Bury states in his commentary on line 1 that the Muse invoked is Clio, who is mentioned by name in line 83. His interpretation of τεὰν ... κατ' αἶcαν here is as follows: "That Aristoclides is possessed of the valour that wins renown (κλέοc) his very name ('Αριcτο-κλείδαc) is a sign, and for the same reason he is the favourite of Clio (Κλειώ, who sings τὰ κλέα ἀνδρῶν). This idea is expressed by τεὰν κατ' αἶcαν, 'under thy auspices' ... For αἶcα means 'omen' ... and here suggests that the name Aristoclides is ominous." (*ad loc.*, p. 48). This interpretation is accepted by Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 255). First, αἶcα does not mean 'omen'. Second, the listener has upto this point no idea of the appearance of Clio in line 83.[56]

The mss.-reading τεάν is untenable. The scholiast on this line gives a clue as to what must have been the correct reading: διὰ τὸ cόν, φηcί, μέροc, ὦ Μοῦcα, ἢ ὦ Αἴγινα, ὅ ἐcτι τοῦ ὕμνου τυχών. κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μερίδα καὶ cπουδὴν, ὅcον γε αὐτῶι ἀνῆκε (Σ. 25, III 46 Dr.); the first sentence confirms the second person possessive pronoun, but the second (alternative) paraphrase shows that the (another?) scholiast had (also?) a text at his disposal reading a third person possessive pronoun. Therefore, De Pauw suggested to read ἑάν or θ' ἑάν (Christ reads ϝεὰν). The best solution, however, is γ' ἑάν, which was proposed by Negris. From ΓΕΑΝ to ΤΕΑΝ is a plausible majuscle corruption.[57] The reading οὐκ ... 'Αριcτοκλείδαc γ' ἑὰν | ἐμίανε κατ' αἶcαν gives excellent sense in the context[58]:

- *Semantics:* **αἶcα** is 'share, portion.'

Cf. νῦν δ' εὐρυλείμων πότνιά cοι Λιβύα | δέξεται εὐκλέα νύμφαν δώμαcιν ἐν χρυcέοιc | πρόφρων· ἵνα οἱ χθονὸc αἶcαν | αὐτίκα cυντελέθειν ἔννομον δωρήcεται, *P.*9.55-7. Especially of a 'share' of the spoils of war: Ἴλιον

---

[56] Thus also Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 17. Instone himself interprets: "'Thanks to you, Muse, not with reproaches did A. stain the famous agora, but he wins the cry of victory' (14-18). The Muse is thanked because she inspired the victory-song. In *N.*3 the hyperbaton has placed the phrase τεάν | ... κατ' αἶcαν in the negative first clause when it belongs also to the positive second clause which carries the emphasis" (pp. 17/8). This is not supported by the Greek. Aristoclidas is not the subject of φέρει in 18, as I will argue below. And even if he were, τεὰν | ... κατ' αἶcαν does not modify the phrase in which it does not occur. And even if it did, the Muse would be said to have inspired the impromptu hip hip hurray, referred to by τὸ καλλίνικον, which would unacceptably degrade her role, especially after the poet's grand confession of his depending on her for the present, by far more pretentious undertaking.

[57] Confusion between uncial *tau* and *gamma* can be paralleled, e.g., by *N.*11.35, where D has ἀνάτων for the correct ἀνάγων. Matthiae's θεάν (= θεῖαν) is less convincing.

[58] For the value of γ' see my note on the previous verse.

ἐκπέρσαντα λαχόντα τε ληΐδος αἶσαν, *Il.*18.327; *Od.*5.40, 13.138. Cf. also ἠὼς γὰρ ἔργοιο τρίτην ἀπομείρεται αἶσαν, Hes.*Op.*578.

It is more frequently used to refer to what we might call the 'portion of life' and which, like μοῖρα and πότμος, we tend to render by words like 'lot, fortune, destiny'. While μοῖρα and μόρος refer to the individual and incidental 'portion of life' allotted to man, and while πότμος is used for the permanent destiny of man, to a man's destined path of life, all changes from happiness to ruin and from misfortune to felicity included (see my note on *N.*5.40/1, pp. 167/8), αἶσα in Pindar is the more general 'portion of life, destiny' that is inherent to one's being, to what someone is.[59]

Cf. χρὴ τὰ ἐοικότα πὰρ δαιμόνων μαστευέμεν θναταῖς φρασίν | γνόντα τὸ πὰρ ποδός, οἵας εἰμὲν αἴσας. | μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον | σπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, *P.*3.59-62, we, mortals, must keep the obvious in mind, what αἶσα is characteristic for us, i.e., what our role is in the world and what opportunities this does and does not bring with it; Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰεὶ δὲ τοιαύταν Ἀμένα παρ' ὕδωρ | αἶσαν ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν διακρίνειν ἔτυμον λόγον ἀνθρώπων. | σύν τοι τίν κεν ἁγητὴρ ἀνήρ, | υἱῷ τ' ἐπιτελλόμενος, δᾶμον γεραίρων τράποι σύμφωνον ἐς ἡσυχίαν, *P.*1.67-70, where τοιαύταν αἶσαν distinguishes between the destinies inherent to being an ἀστός or βασιλεύς; τῶν γὰρ ἀνὰ πόλιν εὑρίσκων τὰ μέσα μακροτέρῳ | {σὺν} ὄλβῳ τεθαλότα, μέμφομ' αἶσαν τυραννίδων· | ξυναῖσι δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖς τέταμαι, *P.*11.52-4, 'I do not care to posses a tyranny[60]', i.e., the destiny inherent to this function; πλατεῖαι πάντοθεν λογίοισιν ἐντὶ πρόσοδοι | νᾶσον εὐκλέα τάνδε κοσμεῖν· ἐπεί σφιν Αἰακίδαι | ἔπορον ἔξοχον αἶσαν ἀρετὰς ἀποδεικνύμενοι μεγάλας, | πέταται δ' ἐπί τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσας τηλόθεν | ὄνυμ' αὐτῶν, *N.*6.45-9, Aegina plays an outstanding role, holds a very special place in the world, because of the prowess which the Aeacids proved to possess; θεὸς | τῶνδε κείνων τε κλυτὰν αἶσαν παρέχοι φιλέων, *O.*6.101/2; [ὁ δ'] ἐχθρὰ νοήσαις | ἤδη φθόνος οἴχεται τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων· | χρὴ δ' ἄνδρα τοκεῦσι(ν) φέρειν βαθύδοξον αἶσαν, *Pae.*2.54-8; γαρύσομαι τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν τιμαῖσιν ἀγακλέα τὰν Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἶσαν | Ἐρχομενοῖό τε πατρώιαν ἄρουραν, | ἅ νιν ἐρειδόμενον ναυαγίαις | ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἁλὸς ἐν κρυοέσσαι | δέξατο συντυχίαι· | νῦν δ' αὖτις ἀρχαίας ἐπέβασε Πότμος | συγγενὴς εὐαμερίας, *I.*1.34-40.

In Homer it is considerably more difficult to attach a more specific sense than 'fate, destiny' to αἶσα and there are numerous places that lead one to the suspicion that in Homer αἶσα and μοῖρα/μόρος are used as

---

[59] U. Bianchi, *ΔΙΟΣ ΑΙΣΑ, destino, uomini e divinità nell' epos, nelle teogonie e nel culto dei Greci*, Roma 1953, has argued that αἶσα is the more general idea, while μόρος and μοῖρα apply to the experience of individuals. N. Yamagata, *Homeric Morality*, p. 116, argues that μοῖρα and αἶσα are 'divided' and 'measured' portions respectively.

[60] Thus Young, *Three Odes*, p. 14. This passage is however controversial. For a more detailed analysis, see Young, *ibid.* pp. 6-15.

metrical alternatives for one and the same concept: τὸν νῦν c' ἠνώγειν ἀποπεμπέμεν ὅττι τάχιστα· | οὐ γάρ οἱ τῇδ' αἶcα φίλων ἄπο νόcφιν ὀλέcθαι, | ἀλλ' ἔτι μοῖρ' ἐcτὶ φίλους τ' ἰδέειν καὶ ἱκέcθαι | οἶκον ἐc ὑψόροφον καὶ ἑὴν ἐc πατρίδα γαῖαν, *Od*.5.112-5. Cf. also τοι ... μοῖρα θανεῖν, *Il*.7.52, with μοι αἶcα τεθνάμεναι, *Il*.24.224, and coὶ ... μόρcιμόν ἐcτι ... δαμῆναι, *Il*.19.417, with τοι ... δαμήμεναι αἴcιμόν ἐcτιν, *Il*.21.291. Cf. also ἐπεί νύ τοι αἶcα μίνυνθά περ, οὔ τι μάλα δήν· | νῦν δ' ἅμα ὠκύμορος καὶ ὀιζυρὸc περὶ πάντων | ἔπλεο, *Il*.1.416-8. Cf. also χάζεο, διογενὲc Πατρόκλειc· οὔ νύ τοι αἶcα | cῶι ὑπὸ δουρὶ πόλιν πέρθαι Τρώων ἀγερώχων, *Il*.16.707/8, with οὐδ' ἄρ' Ὀδυccῆι μεγαλήτορι μόρcιμον ἦεν | ἴφθιμον Διὸc υἱὸν ἀποκτάμεν, *Il*.5.674/5, etc.

When someone acts παρ' αἶcαν, he acts in defiance his role in the world.

As in τὰν οὐδὲ Πορφυρίων μάθεν | παρ' αἶcαν ἐξερεθίζων, *P*.8.12/3, where Porphyrion, the king of Giants, acted in defiance of his role in the universe by climbing the Olympus in order to overthrow the dominion of the gods. Cf. also ἱκόμαν | οἴκαδ', ἀρχαίαν κομίζων πατρὸc ἐμοῦ, βαcιλευομέναν | οὐ κατ' αἶcαν, τάν ποτε Ζεὺc ὤπαcεν λαγέται | Αἰόμωι καὶ παιcὶ τιμάν. | πεύθομαι γάρ νιν Πελίαν ἄθεμιν λευκαῖc πιθήcαντα φραcὶν | ἀμετέρων ἀποcυλᾶcαι βιαίωc ἀρχεδικᾶν τοκέων, *P*.4.105-110, the τίμα of being king is not performed κατ' αἶcαν, not in accordance with the division of roles.

Homer uses the expression ὑπὲρ αἶcαν: ὄφρα μὲν ἠέλιοc μέcον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει, | τόφρα μάλ' ἀμφοτέρων βέλε' ἥπτετο, πῖπτε δὲ λαόc· | ἦμοc δ' ἠέλιοc μετενίccετο βουλυτόνδε, καὶ τότε δή ῥ' ὑπὲρ αἶcαν Ἀχαιοὶ φέρτεροι ἦcαν, *Il*.16.778-80, the Greeks were more successful than they should be on the basis of their strength, they wanted too much; this sentence is the introduction of the scene of Patroclus thrice attempting to sack Troy with his own hands; οὐ γάρ τίc μ' ὑπὲρ αἶcαν ἀνὴρ Ἄιδι προϊάψει, | μοῖραν δ' οὔ τινα φημὶ πεφυγμένον ἔμμεν ἀνδρῶν, | οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐcθλόν, ἐπὴν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται, *Il*.6.487-9.

The expression κατ' αἶcαν has reference to what is done in accordance to one's role in the world.

Cf. θεὸc εἴη | ἀπήμων κέαρ· εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑμνητὸc οὗτοc ἀνὴρ γίνεται coφοῖc, | ὃc ἂν χερcὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾶι κρατήcαιc | τὰ μέγιcτ' ἀέθλων ἕληι τόλμαι τε καὶ cθένει, | καὶ ζώων ἔτι νεαρὸν | κατ' αἶcαν υἱὸν ἴδηι τυχόντα cτεφάνων Πυθίων. | ὁ χάλκεοc οὐρανὸc οὔ ποτ' ἀμβατὸc αὐτῶι· | ὅcαιc δὲ βροτὸν ἔθνοc ἀγλαΐαc ἁπτόμεcθα, περαίνει πρὸc ἔcχατον | πλόον, *P*.10.22-9; δὶc δ' ἐ[ν Νεμέ]αι Κρονίδα Ζηνὸc παρ' ἁγνὸν | βωμό[ν· ἁ κλειν]ά τε Θήβα | δέκτ[ο νιν ε]ὐρύχορόν τ' Ἄργο[c Cικυώ]ν τε κατ' αἶcαν, B.10.29-32. Cf. also *P*.4.107 (*v.s.*).

The expression κατ' αἶcαν is traditionally interpreted as 'fitly, duly' (LSJ, Gildersleeve *ad P*.10.26), or 'befittingly' (Slater). However, this interpretation degrades the expression to a meaningless stopgap. Why would it, e.g., in *P*.10.26, be 'befitting' that the son wins Pythian crowns? κατ' αἶcαν in *P*.10.26 has reference to the fulfillment of the expectancy with respect to the son based on the success-

es of his father. Pindar frequently gives voice to the idea that the qualities necessary to win at the games are hereditary. So the fact that the father was successful provides the son with the αἶcα of being a successful athlete himself. When he does in fact win, he does so in accordance with this αἶcα. The same holds true for B.10.32, with this difference that the expectancy with respect to this victor had not been based on the successes of his father, but on his own previous successes.

The phrase ἐὰν κατ' αἶcαν here has to be interpreted in the same fashion. By winning the pancration Aristiclidas did great honour to his ancestors, and he did so in accordance with his αἶcα. It was his αἶcα, his 'role' and 'destiny', to win. The situation here is quite similar to the one in *P.*10.26. Here ἐὰν κατ' αἶcαν has reference to the fulfillment of the expectancy with respect to Aristoclidas based on the successes of his ancestors, the great Myrmidon warriors. Because of their accomplishments it was Aristoclidas' 'destiny' to win.

N.3.29. ἕπεται δὲ λόγωι δίκας ἄωτος ἐcλὸν αἰνεῖν

• (1) D has ἐcλὸc, B has ἐcλὸν, and V has ἐcλὸc with ἐcλὸν written above the line. Σ.49b (III 50 Dr.) explains ἐcλὸc as a Doric plural masculine: τὸ ἐcλὸc ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐcλοὺc. This scholion is found in B and D. In V the scholion reads ἐcλὸν αἰνεῖν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐcλοὺc ἀγαθοὺc ἐπαινεῖν.

Since ἐcλōc (spelled ἐcλοὺc according to modern conventions) does not go with the metre,[61] the interpretation of ἐcλὸc as a plural accusative depends on a positive answer to the question whether Pindar used a plural accusative on -ŏc. See Irigoin, *Histoire du texte*, pp. 25/6; Wyatt, 'Short Accusative Plurals in Greek', *TAPhA* 97, 1966, 617-43; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 277 n. 3. Conclusive evidence for its existence is lacking. Even if such a short accusative plural did exist, one can be absolutely certain that Pindar did not use it here, because of the ensuing ambiguity with the nominative, which can easily be avoided by using a generalizing singular.

Von Leutsch and Mezger accepted the reading ἐcλὸc, interpreting it as a nominative, qualifying ἄωτοc (taking αἰνεῖν as its epexegetical infinitive and λόγοc to refer to Pindar's ode: 'adjuncta autem meo verbo justitia egregia ad laudandum est, i.e. summo jure Aeacum

---

[61] Entirely unique is Bury's interpretation of this line (*Nemean Odes*, Appendix A, note 3, pp. 229-31). Bury states that "in Pindar's use ἄωτοc has frequently the secondary meanings of 'breath' or 'breeze'" and translates: 'my tale, on its errand to praise noble men (reading the metrically incorrect ἐcλōc), is escorted by a wind that blows fair', to indulge, subsequently, for almost two pages, in the association of ἄωτοc with Αἰακόc and αἰετόc.

nunc laudeo'). This is, however, "highly questionable on semantic grounds. Since the metaphorical senses of ἄωτος already have a superlative connotation, ... its use with the positive degree of a general commendatory adjective such as ἐσλὸς is extreme bathos," as Carnes (*Hermes* 122, 1994, 361/2) rightly observes, especially since the more colourful ἄωτος precedes it. However, Carnes does accept the reading ἐσλός, as a nominative. He takes αἰνεῖν as a epexegetical infinitive ruled by ἐσλός and refers δίκας ἄωτος to Aeacus, paraphrasing: 'Aiakos, the flower of justice, good to praise (suitable for praise), follows (accompanies) the λόγος (i.e., the 'tale' or 'praise')' (p. 362 with n. 14). This interpretation founders on several grounds. First, although Pindar uses ἄωτος referring to persons, Aeacus cannot possibly be called δίκας ἄωτος, since this entails that Aeacus is a δίκα (contrast: πατέρων ἄωτον, *O.*2.7; ναυτᾶν ἄωτος, *P.*4.188; ἡρώων ἄωτοι, *N.*8.9; ἄωτος ἡρώω[ν], *fr.*111a.7; γενναίων ἄωτος, *fr.*6b.f). Second, in spite of Carnes' note 13, his interpretation requires αἰνεῖσθαι rather than αἰνεῖν. Third, his interpretation cannot be squared with the internal structure of the sentence: it entails that a hearer would take Aeacus to be the subject of ἕπεται, for which there is no signal whatsoever; then, he is supposed to take δίκας ἄωτος as an apposition, instead of as the subject of ἕπεται; finally, he is supposed to take ἐσλός as a second apposition to the presumed subject of ἕπεται instead of as qualifying ἄωτος that immediately precedes it.

•(2) If the reading ἐσλὸν of BV^sV^1 is accepted, the main question is: Is ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν an apposition to δίκας ἄωτος or to λόγωι? The former option implies that **λόγωι** must be taken to refer to the 'story' Pindar is telling. Thus Dissen ('adest autem verbo meo iustitiae summum decus, bonorum in praedicatione positum'), Puech ('avec mon dire s'accorde justice la plus stricte').[62] Word order seems to plead in favour of this. The problem is, however, that λόγος on its own, unqualified, can hardly mean 'my words of praise.'

Contrast: ὃς τάνδε νᾶσον εὐκλέϊ προσέθηκε λόγωι, line 68 below, where the adjective defines the nature of the λόγος (cf. *N.*7.32); ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι | λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἁδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον, *N.*7.20/1, where the genitive defines the λόγος as a 'tale, account' (cf. ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ | παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελθεῖν, *N.*4.71/2; κλεινὸς Αἰακοῦ λόγος, *I.*9.1); καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ | λόγον ἐκέρδαναν· κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς | μυρίον χρόνον, *I.*5.26-8, where 'heroic warriors have gained λόγος' only makes sense if λόγος refers to '(tales of) praise,' as the next sentence makes clear unequivocal-

[62] Farnell ('the flower of justice crowns the tale of praise of noble men') seems to take ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν as an apposition to λόγωι, while referring λόγος to the poet's 'tale of praise'.

ly; ἐγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως | ... ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον, | ὡς κτλ, *N.*1.33-5, and the 'story' enfolds (cf. *N.*5.29). Contrast also passages like: ἀπό μοι λόγον | τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον, *O.*9.35/6, etc.

λόγος simply means 'word.' Taking ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν as an apposition to λόγος has the advantage that the nature of the λόγος is defined by its the content as a 'maxim, precept.' Thus Fennell ('The flower of justice concurs with the maxim "praise the noble"'), Sandys ('but the flower of justice still attendeth the precept, "praise the noble"'), Bowra in his translation ('high Justice wafts the saying: "Praise the noble"'). For λόγος referring to a 'precept, saying, maxim' (and for its content), cf. ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλὸν | μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾶι καλύψαι, *N.*9.6/7; τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶι πεπονομένον εὖ | μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἁλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω· | κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν | παντὶ θυμῶι σύν τε δίκαι καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν, *P.*9.93-6.

For **ἕπομαι** in the sense of 'following' precepts, rules, etc., cf., e.g. ἐγὼ δ' ὑψίθρονον Κλωθὼ κασιγνήτας τε προσενέπω ἑπέσθαι κλυταῖς | ἀνδρὸς φίλου Μοίρας ἐφετμαῖς, *I.*6.16-8; ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἑπόμενοι ... | ... κελαδησόμεθα, *O.*10.78/9, etc. Cf. also ἕπεται δὲ λόγος εὐθρόνοις | Κάδμοιο κούραις, *O.*2.22/3, introducing references to Semele and Ino; the verb makes clear that the λόγος, Pindar's 'speech', will deal with Cadmus' daughters.

The use of λόγος here does not necessarily imply that ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν is a quotation, as the use of inverted commas in the Bowra and Snell-Maehler editions seems to suggest.[63]

Word order seems at first sight to plead against this interpretation. One may feel uncomfortable about the apposition to λόγωι jumping over δίκας ἄωτος. However, this objection disappears as soon as one realizes that λόγωι in itself is vague, so as to demand specification, whereas δίκας ἄωτος is an admittedly surprising, but comprehensible and self-contained phrase.[64] Moreover, on closer consideration word order is effective. It constitutes a climax. In ἕπεται λόγωι δίκας ἄωτος each word is followed by a more specific, by a more colourful one, while the uncertainty as to which 'word' ultimate δίκα is following creates a tension; ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν then falls into place; the point has been made.

---

[63] Norwood, *CPh* 38, 1943, 138/9, expressed his doubts whether "we are to believe that there existed a maxim 'praise the good'. Greek ethical dicta are often commonplace, but this goes too far. Of course, no other evidence for such a λόγος is forthcoming." The use of λόγος here does not necessarily exclude the possibility of Pindar himself having formulated the 'precept, maxim'.

[64] One can imagine the cognitive process of the hearer to run as follows: 'It follows [who follows whom?] the word [who follows which word?] ultimate δίκα [I see, ultimate δίκα follows the word; but which word?] praise the noble [that word, I see; that is some kind of precept; so ultimate δίκα follows the precept that one should praise the noble; that is interesting]'.

•(3) If this sentence means 'Ideal justice follows the precept praise the noble'—how does it fit into Pindar's motivation of the break-off? The difficulty is adequaltely demonstrated by Bury, who complains that both with Dissen's and with Fennell's interpretation this line "stultifies the point of Pindar's argument. He cuts short his eulogy of Heracles that he may celebrate the the praises of Peleus and Achilles: why? Because it is the essence of justice to praise the noble. Therefore, according to this interpretation, Pindar either wrote a line that had no point, or suggested the proposition that Heracles was not noble. Neither the procedure nor the doctrine are Pindaric." (*ad loc.*, p. 51, see also Bergk and Mezger *ad loc.*, and Carnes, *Hermes* 122, 1994, 360/1).

The difficulty as to the status and relevance of this line in the light of what has preceded and follows is caused by the absence of explicit signals defining it. In line 29 δέ marks the next sentence (29) as a next, independent step in the sequence. The marked position before δέ is occupied by ἕπεται, a verb which by virtue of its morphological form excludes the possibility of the subject being continuous, thus defining the discontinuity effected by δέ as discontinuity of subject. δ' (οὐ δ', 30) marks the next sentence (30) as yet another independent step in the sequence. So we only have δέ twice, which leaves the interpretation of the role both sentences play in the light of what has preceded and the relation between both sentences entirely to the hearer (see introduction, pp. 26-30). Both sentences (29/30) together contain a motivation for the break-off, so their mutual relation must be antithetical. Lines 29/30 together impart that, although it is always good to praise noble men, one should prefer to praise those of one's own country, as also Farnell argued (*ad loc.*, II, p. 257, followed by Erbse, *Hermes* 97, 1969, 279).[65]

This, leaves us with the question why neither the fact that both sentences are a motivation of what has preceded, nor the antithesis between both sentences are being explicitly marked as such (e.g., by means of γάρ and ἀλλά or μέντοι respectively).

•(4) Before addressing this question the semantics of δίκα and ἄωτος must be dealt with. **δίκα** is 'the way it should be.' This applies

---

[65] Carnes (*Hermes* 122, 1994, 361) objects to Farnell and Erbse that "this attempt to rescue the relevance and continuity of the line forces the two words ἐςλὸν αἰνεῖν to convey a complex chain of reasoning". It will be clear that this chain of reasoning is not conveyed by ἐςλὸν αἰνεῖν (as, admittedly, Erbse seems to suggest), but by lines 29 and 30 together. Sandys seems to suggest in his translation that this line implicitly objects to breaking off the story of Heracles: 'I bid thee summon the Muse in honour of Aeacus, but the flower of justice still attendeth the precept, "praise the noble"'.

to any field of interest. In a political context, the notion refers to the totality of laws, values, and arrangements agreed upon, that may be used to designate the generally accepted situation. See further my notes on *P.*8.1 and *P.*8.71 (pp. 468, 565/6). Pindar sometimes applies δίκα to his obligations as an encomiastic poet. The idea covered by the notion δίκα in such contexts is quite obvious: 'the way it should be' is that a man who has made great accomplishments must be praised for them (the χρέος motif, see my note on *P.*8.33, pp. 513-5).[66]

This maxim is formulated—like *h.l.* as maxim (λόγος)—in: ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλὸν | μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾶι καλύψαι, *N.*9.6/7. The same idea occurs in: εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἄποινα χρὴ μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν, | χρὴ δὲ κωμάζοντ' ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν βαστάσαι, *I.*3.7/8. Even more extreme is the formulation in: τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶι πεποναμένον εὖ | μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἁλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω· | κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν | παντὶ θυμῶι σύν τε δίκαι καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν, *P.*9.93-6, where it is explicitly stated that this maxim even applies to enemies, which is a rather fargoing thing to say from a Greek point of view. Moreover it is explicitly stated that is is σὺν δίκαι, in accordance with δίκα, to praise someone καλὰ ῥέζων, even if he is one's enemy.

The sentence in which δίκα occurs here is part of a transitional passage, motivating the shift that occurs from Heracles to the Aeacids. The ideal manifestation of the way it should be follows the precept praise the nobe. The next sentence (line 30) forms a limitation of this concept, stating that, though this is very true, it is not good to indulge oneself in foreign glory. Together both sentences (29/30) motivate the break-off, by giving the reason for preferring the Aeacids over Heracles, while making perfectly certain that the poet is not misunderstood and accused of underrating the great god-hero. So in their direct context these lines have reference to poetic procedures; and consequently, δίκας ἄωτος refers to the utmost realisation of the way it should be in poetry, i.e., praising the man who deserves to be praised, which, in this context, applies to Heracles as well as to the Aeacids.

On the other hand, these statements are gnomic, which means that they are meant to apply to and have significance for *any* situation, not merely the situation that prompted their formulation. Lifted out of their immediate context—and gnomic statements are because of their generic pretentions meant to have a wider applica-

[66] δίκα does not refer 'encomiastic propriety', i.e. due *measure* of praise, as Gundert, *Dichterberuf*, p. 65, proposes for *h.l.*: 'Es gehört zur Rede ein Gesetz von Fug und Maß (eine δίκα), um den Edlen zu loben'. See my note on *P.*8.71, pp. 565/6.

tion than their immediate context alone—, lines 29/30 ('The pick of the bunch of δίκα follows the precept "praise the noble". Desires for what belongs to others are not stronger for a man to bear') formulate a fundamental aspect of aristocratic ethics: ἐcλὸν αἰνεῖν (29) is the way it should be. Thus, this precept is not only the shortest possible description of what Pindar's own poetry is all about, but also contains in a nutshell how aristocracy wants the world to be, the happy few, the ἐcλοί, running the show, and being praised for that. Line 30, in this connection, is all but directly addressed to the have-nots, in that it states that things should stay the way they are.

For a generic singular with a collective reference cf. Ἀργεΐαι cὺν αἰχμᾶι, *O.*7.19 ("for αἰχματαῖc [also E.*Heracl.*276]", Verdenius *ad loc.* [I, p. 55]); εὕδει δ' ἀνὰ cκάπτωι Διὸc αἰετόc, ὠκεῖαν πτέρυγ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν χαλάξαιc, *P.*1.6; μοιρίδιον | ἆμαρ ἢ νύκτεc, *P.*4.255/6 (cf. *Il.*5.490, = 22.432, 24.73). Cf. also passages in which ἀνήρ refers to any man in general, cited in my note on line 30, and ἀνθρώποι in *N.*5.18. See further Kühner-Gerth I, pp. 12-3; Schwyzer, II, p. 42; Hummel, *Syntaxe*, p. 51.

So δίκα here refers to 'the way should be', both in an epinicion and in society in general; the direct context of which lines 29/30 are a part steers the hearer to apply the notion in the former way, while the generic character of the utterance in combination with what may be called the pragmatic context of the performance of the ode (a scion of a noble family being praised in the presence of the entire Aeginetan community, a situation that visualizes the supposed superioriy of the happy few) guides him to apply it in the more general way.

• (5) **ἄωτοc**[67] is 'the cream of the crop, the pick of the bunch, the crème de la crème.' The noun denotes the best possible, the ideal specimen of the notion referred to by the genitive adjunct. "This word occurs more often (twenty times) in Pindar than in all other extant authors combined and is clearly his favourite term to denote 'the finest'" (Gerber on *O.*1.15, pp. 37/8).[68]

In Homer it is used mainly with the attributive adjuncts οἰόc and λίνοιο, referring to the finest wool and the best linen. Cf. ἐυcτρεφεῖ οἰὸc ἀώτωι, | cφενδόνηι, *Il.*13.599/600, cf. 716; ἔνθ' ὅ γε παννύχιοc, κεκαλυμμένοc οἰὸc ἀώτωι, | βούλευε φρεcὶν ἧιcιν ὁδόν, τὴν πέφραδ' Ἀθήνη, *Od.*1.443/4; κώεά τε ῥῆγόc τε λίνοιό τε λεπτὸν ἄωτον, *Il.*9.661. For contrasting views, see Raman and Verdenius cited below.

---

[67] Pindar uses only ὁ ἄωτοc. The gender is indeterminate in Homer and Aeschylus. A.R. and later epic only use τὸ ἄωτον.

[68] Cf. also Radt's interesting remark (on *Pae.*6.59, p. 128): "ἄωτοc ist ein Lieblingswort Pindars, mit dem er das jeweils Höchste in seiner art bezeichnet; es ersetzt auf diese Weise den Superlativ, der bei Pindar verhältnismässig selten und vor allem der religiösen Sphäre vorbehalten ist". See also Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, pp. 78/9.

Pindar expands the application of this noun by using it with attributive adjuncts referring to abstractions and to persons.

Cf. (Ἱέρων) ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καὶ | μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀώτωι, | οἷα παίζομεν φίλαν | ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν, *O.*1.14-7, where the reference is to symposia at Hieron's court, where Hieron himself 'shines, takes delight in the crème de la crème of music' produced by Pindar and other guests[69]; ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων | ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον, *P.*10.53/4, where Pindar defines the thematic conduct of the ideal encomiastic hymn. In ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἁβρόν, | εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον, *I.*1.50/1, γλώσσας is used as a metaphor for 'what people say', and πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον is, subsequently, the 'best possible reputation among (fellow-) citizens and strangers'. Cf. δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβωι, | εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούηι, *I.*5.12/3, 'there are only two things which tend (take care of) the ideal life', i.e., the ideal life consists in enjoying success and having a good reputation. In *P.*4 the hospitality and joy Jason enjoys in the palace of his refound father is described as: ἀθρόαις πέντε δραπὼν νύκτεσσιν ἔν θ' ἁμέραις | ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον, *P.*4.130/1. In χρὴ ... | Αἰγίναι Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν, *I.*8.16, the reference is to 'the best the Graces have to offer', i.e., the best possible hymn. Cf. also σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον, *I.*7.18; μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκύν, *Pae.*6.59.

There are a few passages where the genitive adjunct to ἄωτος does not define the category of things of which ἄωτος is the 'crème de la cème', but has a different function. In ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι ... | θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυθίοισί τε νικᾶν | Τιμονόου παῖδ', *N.*2.6-10, Ἰσθμιάδων ... ἄωτον refers to the 'best part of the Isthmian Games', which is, of course, a victory. This instance may be the key to the understanding of two more baffling occurences of the noun. First: ἐν Νεμέαι μὲν πρῶτον, ὦ Ζεῦ, | τὶν ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στεφάνων, | νῦν αὖτε Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπόται | ... | Φυλακίδα νικῶντος, *I.*6.3-7. This can hardly mean that the Nemean crown is considered to be the best of all crowns, since this would diminish the glory of the victory presently celebrated. To my mind, the genitive adjunct στεφάνων here does not define the category of things of which ἄωτος is the crème de la cème, but rather explains of which the ἄωτος consits: 'first in Nemea they have obtained the best thing there is, namely your crown'. Comparable to this is: ὑψηλᾶν ἀρετᾶν καὶ στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκὺν | τῶν Οὐλυμπίαι ... καρδίαι γελανεῖ | ἀκαμαντόποδός τ' ἀπήνας δέκευ Ψαύμιός τε δῶρα, *O.*5.1-3, 'accept the best and sweetest thing there is, success and a crown from Olympia, as a gift from Psaumias and his mules'. Slightly different is: Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον ὀρθώσαις, ἀκαμαντοπόδων | ἵππων ἄωτον, *O.*3.3/4, where the Olympian victory-hymn, as a symbol of the victory itself, is said to be the best thing Theron's horses

[69] For the praise of Hieron's culture in comparable terms, cf. *O.*6.96/7, B.3.70/1. For the use of ἐν here, see Dodds on E.*Bacch.*159, Verdenius on *O.*7.12.

have to offer. Thus also: ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρὴ μναμοσύναν ἀνεγείροντα φράσαι | χειρῶν ἄωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπίνικον, | ἕκτος οἷς ἤδη στέφανος περίκειται φυλλοφόρων ἀπ' ἀγώνων, *O*.8.74-6, where ἐπίνικον explains the nature of 'the best thing their hands (i.e. their wrestling skills) have to offer'.

See also R.A. Raman, 'Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος. A Semantic Problem', *Glotta* 53, 1975, 195-207, offering an explanation for the semantic development of this noun from Homer to Pindar. See further Bury, *Nemean Odes*, Appendix A, note 2, and Verdenius on *O*.3.4 (*Commentaries* I, p. 9). See now also D.L. Cairns, '"Αωτος, "Ανθος, and the Death of Archemorus in Bacchylides' Ninth Ode', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10, 1998, 57-73.

All the same, the phrase **δίκας ἄωτος** is quite remarkable, since the notion δίκα does not really allow of scalar presentation.[70] Something is δίκα or it is not. In other words, the phrase gives great emphasis and pregnancy to the notion δίκα (in English one could perhaps say, e.g., 'that is extremely correct', with a similar defiance of strict logic, in order to emphasize that we consider something to be correct and that we consider it of great importance that it is correct). This is quite a strong hint that δίκα has a wider applicability than the poetic procedures that are being dealt with in the immediate context.

Unnecessarily emphatic confirmation can signal broadening or change of perspective: "Can you imagine? Leaving Pat Bonner on the bench! Jack Charlton really sticks his neck out. Don't you think?"—"You are extremely right." Cf. also "No animal is half so vile / As Crocky-Wock the crocodile. / On Saturdays he likes to crunch / Six juicy children for his lunch, / And he especially enjoys / Just three of each, three girls, three boys. / He smears the boys (to make them hot) / With mustard from the mustard pot. / But mustard doesn't go with girls, / It tastes all wrong with plaits and curls. / With them, what goes extremely well / Is butterscotch and caramel. / It's such a super marvellous treat / When boys are hot and girls are sweet. / At least that's Crocky's point of view. / He ought to know. He's had a few.", Roald Dahl, 'The Crocodile', *Dirty Beasts*, London 1986, [p. 8], where the unnecessarily emphatic phrase "such a super marvellous treat" helps to signal the broadening of perspective that is to occur in the next line.

This phenomenon can be explained with the help of Grice's well-known 'cooperative principle'[71]. The unnecessarily emphatic words, ἄωτος and "extremely", are (meant to be) allarming to the hearer, be-

[70] Surely, someone or something can be more or less δίκαιος, in that he, she, or it more or less approaches the standards of δίκα. But it is surprising to find a passage in which it is implied that there is such a thing as one δίκα that is the finest, standing out above all other δίκαι, as it were.

[71] 'Logic and Conversation', *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (P. Cole & J.L. Morgan, edd.), New York 1975, 41-58. The 'cooperative principle' entails that the hearer will always assume that what the speaker says makes sense.

cause their being added seems at first sight to result in the utterances being more informative than required, which would be a violation of the 'maxim of quantity'. Since the 'cooperative principle' entails the blind trust on the part of the hearer that what the speaker says does *not* violate the maxim of quantity, the hearer will first search for other possible intentions of the spreaker before beginning to count with the possibility of the maxim of quantity having been violated. This is the process the speaker is aiming at. This process is comparable to what happens with the seeming violation of the maxim of relation in the case of metaphor (see my *CPh* 89, 1994, 315-327).

Finally, we may return to the question why neither the fact that both sentences are a motivation of what has preceded, nor the antithesis between both sentences is being explicitly marked as such and grasp the motif for Pindar to have left the antithetical relation implicit. With the second, extratextual, line of interpretation ('The ultimate essence of the way it should be [in society] follows the precept: praise an ἐcλόc; and desires for what belongs to others are not stronger for a man to bear [i.e., and do not strive at taking away from the ἐcλοί what is theirs]'), there is no antithesis between lines 29 and 30. If Pindar had provided a signal explicitly indicating that line 30 is antithetical to 29, he would have taken away the ambiguity by excluding the possibility of interpreting lines 29/30 together as referring also to social conditions instead of merely to poetical procedures. The same motif underlies the choice of δέ (instead of, e.g., γάρ) in line 29. By explicitly marking lines 29/30 as a motivation for the transition between two themes, their applicability would have been limited to the immediate context in which they occur.

N.3.74-75. ἐλᾶι δὲ καὶ τέccαραc ἀρετὰc | ὁ θνατὸc αἰών

•(1) *Text:* Ms. B reads ἐλᾶι δὲ καὶ τέccαραc ἀρετὰc | θνατὸc ἐών. Mss. V and D (and X and Z) have μακρὸc αἰών instead of θνατὸc ἐών. Both variants are unmetrical, the metre requiring: ... | ⏑—⏑——. The scholia paraphrase τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον (129a, III 60 Dr.) and ὁ θνητὸc αἰὼν (129b, III 60 Dr.), which confirms the combination of θνατόc with αἰών, not found in our mss., as well as Triclinius' suppletion of the article before θνατόc; in other words, the scholia confirm that ὁ θνατὸc αἰών is an ancient variant. Because this variant is the only one that goes with the metre,[72] and because it gives good sense, it must be adopted. It is read by almost all modern editors (including Schroeder, Bowra, Turyn, Snell-Maehler). ἐών for αἰών is a common phonetic error.

[72] For θν not making position cf. e.g. *O.*1.30, 54, 66, 2.19, etc.

The only alternative is to read ὁ μακρὸς αἰών,[73] as, *i.a.*, Boeckh, Christ, and Gildersleeve[74] do. It must be observed in the first place that this reading, unlike ὁ θνατὸς αἰών, has no manuscriptal authority. The main reason why it is not preferable is καί (74): after the reference to the three μέρη the βρότεον ἔθνος has (73/4), καὶ with τέσσαρας ἀρετάς is only understandible with at least a minimum of *topic continuity* ('mortality has three ages; and it has also four ἀρεταί'). Inclusion of a new *comment* by means of καί is strange in a situation where also the *topic* shifts (cf. 'mortality has three ages; and the long life[75] has also four ἀρεταί'). Second, the combination of the article with θνατὸς αἰών is by far more felicitous than with μακρὸς αἰών[76]. Third, it is by far more easy to imagine that μακρός crept in as a psychological error because of παλαίτερος, or from the margin as a gloss on θνατός, than the other way around. Finally, the loss of the article in our mss. is more difficult to account for with μακρὸς αἰών than with θνατὸς αἰών.[77]

• (2a) *The four virtues:* Many scholars take τέσσαρας ἀρετάς to refer to the four cardinal virtues, familiar enough from popular morality to remain unspecified, φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον being, as it were, the fifth ἀρετά, added by the poet on his own account. Thus Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 261) argues: "The four virtues which are yoked to life are surely those of the old popular morality inherited by Plato, courage, temperance, justice, wisdom ...: all these four virtues in different degrees can be found in any age" and "after reminding his hearers that there are four cardinal virtues—which help him to define ἐξοχώτερος—he adds a prudential maxim dear to him, φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον."

It is true that there are quite a few passages in Plato giving the impression of courage, temperance, justice, and wisdom being regarded as some kind of traditional *tetrad.*

Cf. e.g. περὶ μὲν οὖν δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας τοῦ θεοῦ εἴρηται, περὶ δὲ σοφίας λείπεται, Pl.*Smp.*196d; ἐλπίζω τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, εὑρήσειν αὐτὸ ὧδε. οἶμαι ἡμῖν τὴν πόλιν, εἴπερ ὀρθῶς γε ᾤκισται, τελέως ἀγαθὴν εἶναι. ἀνάγκη γ', ἔφη. δῆλον δὴ ὅτι σοφή τ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ σώφρων καὶ δικαία, Pl.*R.*427e; ἐνάμιλλον ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικε, πρὸς ἀρετὴν πόλεως

---

[73] Moschopulos' conjecture μακρός τοι αἰών is only acceptable for those who think that τοι means nothing.

[74] Gildersleeve in a letter to Charles Eliot Norton (May 22, 1898; now in the Houghton Library, Harvard University no. 1Ms Am 1088 [2684]), published by W.W. Briggs, Jr., *GRBS* 25, 1984, 233-242.

[75] Gildersleeve (in the letter cited) wanted to interpret ὁ μακρὸς αἰών as 'that extreme old age', i.e., as referring to the fourth and final stage of mortal life. The phrase can have this reference only in an indirect manner; it means 'the long life', which imlies old age.

[76] Thus Fennell, p. 29; Bury, p. 60 (quoting R.Y. Tyrrell).

[77] In a majuscle ms. the o may have easily dropped out *per haplographiam.*

τῆι τε σοφίαι αὐτῆς καὶ τῆι σωφροσύνηι καὶ τῆι ἀνδρείαι ἡ τοῦ ἕκαστον ἐν αὐτῆι τὰ αὑτοῦ πράττειν δύναμις. καὶ μάλα, ἔφη. οὐκοῦν δικαιοσύνην τό γε τούτοις ἐνάμιλλον ἂν εἰς ἀρετὴν πόλεως θείης; παντάπασι μὲν οὖν. Pl.*R.*433d/e. Cf. also: εἰσὶ δὲ ἐξειλεγμένοι Περσῶν οἱ ἄριστοι δόξαντες ἐν ἡλικίαι τέτταρες, ὅ τε σοφώτατος καὶ ὁ δικαιότατος καὶ ὁ σωφρονέστατος καὶ ὁ ἀνδρειότατος, Pl.*Alc.* I 121e. Cf. also Pl.*Euthyd.*279b/c, *R.*504a ff, etc.

On the other hand, there are, even in Plato, many passages where the supposedly traditional *tetrad* is expanded by a fifth virtue, or where another virtue takes the place of one of the four traditional ones.

In Pl.*Prt.*329a ff. and 349b ff. ὁσιότης is included in the μόρια τῆς ἀρετῆς. Cf. also *Lach.*199d, *Menex.*78d, *Grg.*507b. In *Phd.*69c, *Lg.*631c φρόνησις takes the place of σοφία. Cf. also *Euthyphr.*12d ff, etc. Also passages like ἐγὼ δὲ καλῶ πρὸς ἀνδρείαι σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἄλλ' ἄττα τοιαῦτα, Pl.*Lach.*198a (cf. also 190c/d), question the very existence of an unshakably traditional list of four cardinal virtues.

Moreover, it is not easy to trace the so-called doctrine of the four cardinal vitues back to any pre-Platonic author. Adam regards Pl.*R.*427e (quoted above) as "apparently the earliest passage in Greek literature where the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues (if by cardinal virtues we mean those which make up the sum of perfect goodness) is expressly enunciated."[78] From authors before Plato Adam is able to quote only X.*Mem.*3.9.1-5, where ἀνδρεία, σοφία, and σωφροσύνη are mentioned; however, the phrase ἔφη δὲ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν σοφίαν εἶναι, 3.9.5, makes it doubtfull whether any kind of traditional *tetrad* underlies the discussion here. X.*Mem.*4.6.1-12, also quoted by Adam, discusses the nature of δίκαια, σοφία, and ἀνδρεία, but also of εὐσέβεια; σωφροσύνη is not mentioned. The closest parallel in tragedy to the so-called doctrine is: σώφρων δίκαιος ἀγαθὸς εὐσεβὴς ἀνήρ, A.*Th.*610.[79]

Against this background it becomes doubtful whether the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues underlies δῖον ἔνθα τέκες | Αἰακὸν βαρυσφαράγωι πατρὶ κεδνότατον | ἐπιχθονίων· ὃ καὶ | δαιμόνεσσι δίκας

---

[78] J. Adam (& D.A. Rees), *The Republic of Plato*, Cambridge 19652, I, p. 224 (on 427e).

[79] Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 181, argues that "this certainly looks like an earlier version of the Platonic list, and in it σώφρων stands for temperance, δίκαιος for justice, ἀγαθός for courage, and εὐσεβής for wisdom. Pindar would certainly accept such a list and welcome the identification of εὐσέβεια with wisdom". Thus any list of four virtues can be taken as referring to the four so-called cardinal ones. The supposition that Pindar could refer to a traditional list by just saying τέσσαρες ἀρεταί necessarily implies that there was an *unvariable* list. One does not refer to 'The Four Virtues', out of the blue, when it is not *exactly* clear which four one means. When it is not clear whether we have to count εὐσέβεια in or not, and whether it is the same as wisdom or not, and whether ἀγαθός is the same as brave, such a reference is highly confusing.

ἐπείρανε· τοῦ μὲν ἀντίθεοι | ἀρίστευον υἱέες υἱέων τ' ἀρηΐφιλοι παῖδες ἀνορέαι | χάλκεον στονόεντ' ἀμφέπειν ὅμαδον, | σώφρονές τ' ἐγένοντο πινυτοί τε θυμόν, *I*.8.21-5, as it is suggested by L. Woodbury, *TAPhA* 78, 1947, 368-75.[80] It is true that δίκας suggests justice, ἀνορέαι courage, σώφρονες temperance, and πινυτοί τε θυμόν wisdom. On the other hand, the passage is completely understandable without any knowledge of the so-called doctrine. The fact that Aeacus acted as a judge among the gods is given by historical (i.e., 'mythical') reality and so are the physical and mental capacities of his sons and grandsons. Moreover, one may argue just as plausibly that βαρυσφαράγωι πατρὶ κεδνότατον | ἐπιχθονίων (and perhaps also δαιμόνεσσι δίκας ἐπείρανε) suggests εὐσέβεια, so that we have five virtues instead of four. I fear that the seeming concurrence of this passage with the list of cardinal virtues we came to regard as traditional is a mere coincidence. Against this one example of a passage where the four so-called cardinal virtues occur, numerous similar passages may be cited where other virtues are mentioned.

Gildersleeve[81] and Bowra[82] suggest that the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues underlies the phrase ἄνηρ τετράγωνος in the opening lines of the famous poem by Simonides: ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι | χαλεπόν, χερσίν τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόωι | τετράγωνον, ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον, *fr*.37.1-3 (=*fr*.4.1-3 D.). I do not believe that this is true. τετράγωνον here is qualified by χερσίν τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόωι, and the phrase as a whole paraphrazes ἀγαθὸν ἀλαθέως. Certainly Aristotle is right in interpreting τετράγωνος as a metaphor for 'perfect': τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα φάναι εἶναι τετράγωνον μεταφορά· ἄμφω γὰρ τέλεια, Arist.*Rh*.1411^{b}26/7.[83]

In sum, traces of the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues before Plato are rare and inconsistent, and they are totally absent in Pindar's time;[84] Plato does never refer to them as 'The Four Virtues,' and even in Plato's texts passages are to be found where

[80] Followed by Bowra, *Pindar*, p. 181, and Briggs, *GRBS* 25, 1984, 239.

[81] In the letter cited: *GRBS* 25, 1984, 238.

[82] Bowra, *Pindar*, pp. 179-82.

[83] For the idea of a square being the perfect figure, cf. e.g. Procl. ad Eucl.*El*.48, Eusth.*ad Il*.1.277.3, etc.

[84] Those scholars who are aware of this lack of evidence try to rescue the relevance of 'The Four Cardinal Virtues' to the age of Pindar by means of the hypothesis that the concept is Pythagorean, presuming that both Pindar and Plato were under Pythagoras' influence (thus, e.g., W.D. Geddes; *Platonis Phaedo*, London 1885, 254-62; Donaldson, p. 210; Gildersleeve in the letter cited: *GRBS* 25, 1984, 237). Neither the hypothesis nor the presumption are tenable. Whenever evidence cannot be found, Pythagoras shows up as the missing link. Soon he will, as the inventor of the 4-3-2-1 system, be called upon in order to constitute the common origin of the 4-3-3 and 4-4-2 concepts.

other virtues than the four traditional ones are just as naturally implied. All this makes it very unlikely that courage, temperance, justice, and wisdom are the four ἀρεταί specifically meant by Pindar. To suppose that Pindar could refer to them by just saying τέccαραc ἀρετάc is to presuppose a more influential, more consistent, and more ancient tradition than is actually attested.[85]

• (2b) Slater, by referring in his *Lexicon* (*s.v.* τέccαρεc, p. 498) to Dodds' commentary on Pl.*Grg.*451e (pp. 200/1), suggests that the four virtues meant here are the four mentioned in an anonymous traditional cκολιόν[86]: ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριcτον ἀνδρὶ θνατῶι, | δεύτερον δὲ φυὰν καλὸν γενέcθαι, | τὸ τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλωc, | καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἡβᾶν μετὰ τῶν φίλων. Although Dodds thinks that the thought expressed here may be old, it seems highly improbable that Pindar is here referring to these four blessings, desirable as they may be. In the *skolion* itself they are not being referred to as ἀρεταί, and it is questionable whether Pindar would regard them as such. 'Health' can hardly be considered to be a virtue in Pindar's frame of reference; it is called a χάριc in: τῶι μὲν διδύμαc χάριταc | εἰ κατέβαν ὑγίειαν ἄγων χρυcέαν κῶμόν τ' ἀέθλων Πυθίων αἴγλαν cτεφάνοιc, *P.*3.72/3. Physical beauty is a reliable index of a man's total worth; it mirrors ἀρετά, but is not in itself an ἀρετά (see my note on line 19 above, pp. 283-5).[87] πλοῦτοc is explicitly distinguished from ἀρεταί in ὁ μὰν πλοῦτοc ἀρεταῖc δεδαιδαλμένοc φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν | καιρόν, *O.*2.53/4 and ὁ πλοῦτοc εὐρυcθενήc, | ὅταν τιc ἀρετᾶι κεκραμένον καθαρᾶι κτλ, *P.*5.1/2.[88] The fourth desirable situation the *skolion* commemorates, 'being young in the midst of one's friends', is no doubt occasioned by the sympotiatic context of the genre, and can hardly be regarded as an ἀρετά either.

The possibility of Pindar referring to any autonomous, traditional *tetrad* of virtues, which could be identified by his audience without any guidance by the context in which they are being referred to, must be excluded. No such traditional *tetrad* existed in Pindar's

[85] Instone, *Eranos* 91, 1993, 25, comes to the same conclusion. As an additional argument against the interpretation of our passage in the light of the 'Four Cardinal Virtues' he quotes Privitera's remark (*GIF* N.S. 8, 1977, 271), that "it would be strange for Pindar to tell a pankratiast that his life requires four moral virtues of whatever specification without mentioning the need for physical strength (a vital requirement for a pankratiast)."

[86] On the genre, see R. Reizenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, chapter i; Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, chapter ix. They are collected in: Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, III 643 ff.; Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, II2.6.16.

[87] Cf. esp. φέρει γὰρ Ἰcθμοῖ | νίκαν παγκρατίου, cθένει τ' ἔκπαγλοc ἰδεῖν τε μορφάειc, ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴcχιον φυᾶc, *I.*7.21/2.

[88] For the relation between wealth and ἀρετά see further my note on *P.*8.88-92, pp. 588/9.

time.[89] The most promising approach seems to look in the context for signals indicating which ἀρεταί are meant.

•(3) The scholia take each of the three age groups as implying its own specific ἀρετά, the fourth being the one that is referred to in the second half of line 75, i.e., φρονεῖν ... τὸ παρκείμενον.

129a (III 60 Dr.): Ἀρίσταρχος· τρεῖς μὲν τὰς καθ' ἡλικίαν, ἃς προεξηρίθμηται, τὸ ἐν παισὶν εἶναι παῖδα, καὶ τὸ ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἄνδρα, καὶ τὸ ἐν παλαιοτέροις παλαιότερον. καὶ τετάρτην δέ φησιν ἐλᾶν ἀρετὴν τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον. τετάρτη οὖν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ αὕτη πρὸς αἷς εἴρηκεν, ὡς δεῖ περὶ τοῦ παρόντος φροντίζειν καὶ μὴ περὶ τῶν ἐσομένων πάντων, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν δύνασθαι ἁρμόζεσθαι.

129b (III 60 Dr.): ὁ θνητὸς αἰὼν καὶ τετάρτην ἀρετὴν ταύτην φέρει, τὸ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος φροντίζειν· ὧν οὐκ ἄπεστιν ὁ Ἀριστκλείδης, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ταῖς τρισί, φησίν, αἷς προκατείληχε, κέκτηται καὶ ταύτην, τουτέστι τοῦ παρόντος φροντίζειν. ἢ ἐν ταὐτῶι ἔχει, ἅπερ οἱ ἄλλοι κατὰ μέρος ἔχομεν.

This interpretation is followed by Mezger,[90] Bury,[91] Fraccaroli (p. 545), Dornseiff, *Pindar*, p. 120, and Wilamowitz (p. 279). It is certainly correct. The context guides the hearer towards this interpretation, as the reference to the three stages of life immediately precedes the reference to the four ἀρεταί. Moreover, the relation between both is suggested strongly by both numerals, τρίτον (72) and τέσσαρας (74)—especially since the former is not strictly necessary—as well as by καί (see below). Moreover, this association of three of the four ἀρεταί with the three stages of life accounts four the use of ἐλᾶι, suggesting that life, in a way, causes the three ἀρεταί (see below).

Which specific ἀρετά does every single age imply? This is not made clear by the context. However, the idea of every age having its own specific ἀρετά can be paralleled by many passages. Most passages give voice to the idea of youth being fit to fight, while elders are good at counseling, and the like.

---

[89] It is unlikely that Pindar was familiar with such a traditional, autonomous, context-independent list of four ἀρεταί also on other grounds. Pindar speaks of μυρίαι ἀρεταί in line 42 above (cf. also *N.*10.2, B.13.8). Moreover, nothing seems to withhold him from calling other virtues ἀρεταί than the four supposedly traditional ones, such as hospitality (*Pae.*6.131), filial devotion (*P.*6.42), ποδῶν ἀρετά (*P.*10.23), etc.; he even speaks of ἀκίνδυνοι ἀρεταί, which are not τίμιαι (*O.*6.10)—not to mention the numerous instances of ἀρετά referring to the manifestations of prowess (see my note on *N.*5.53, pp. 188-90).

[90] "Weil das menschliche Leben vergänglich ist und also auch jede einzelne Stufe ihre bestimmte Zeit hat, nach deren Verlauf sie unwiederbringlich vorüber ist, so gilt es scharf zu erkennen, welche Auszeichnung (ἀρετά) einer jeden gemäß ist und in ihr sich zu bewähren. Hermann hat also Recht, wenn er diese vierte ἀρετά eine allen Lebensaltern gemeinsame nennt: es ist die richtige Erkenntniß des Zeitgemäßen", Mezger *ad loc.* (p. 390).

[91] "Each age has its own excellence, and there is further an excellence common to all alike, *judgement*, φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον", Bury *ad loc.* (p. 59).

Cf. (Sparta) ἔνθα βουλαὶ γερόντων | καὶ νέων ἀνδρῶν ἀριστεύοισιν αἰχμαί, *fr.*199.1/2; cf. also *fr.*172. Cf. also ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ νέων οὐλίαις αἰχμαῖσιν ἀνδρῶν, *O.*13.23.Cf. *P.*4.281/2, A.*Th.*622, *P.*5.109-11, *P.*2.63-7, cited in my note on 72-4 above (p. 387).

This idea underlies the reference to the four ἀρεταί here. The difference, however, is that here we have *three* ages, each of which implies its own characteristic ἀρετά, instead of a simple opposition between young and old. For the association of certain ἀρεταί with specific age groups the following passages may be compared:

Solon (*fr.*27 W.) describes the course of human life in consecutive periods of seven years. The fourth *hebdomad*, the age of a man, is explicitly characterized as the stage of life in which one's strength is at its peak (τῆι δὲ τετάρτηι πᾶς τις ἐν ἑβδομάδι μέγ' ἄριστος | ἰσχύν, ἧι τ' ἄνδρες πείρατ' ἔχουσ' ἀρετῆς, 7/8). In the sixth stage of life a man's νόος is 'disciplined' and 'he no longer wants to do reckless things' (τῆι δ' ἕκτηι περὶ πάντα καταρτύεται νόος ἀνδρός, | οὐδ' ἔρδειν ἔθ' ὁμῶς ἔργ' ἀπάλαμνα θέλει, 11/2), to the effect that in the seventh and eighth period a man's mind and tongue are at their best (ἑπτὰ δὲ νοῦν καὶ γλῶσσαν ἐν ἑβδομάσιν μέγ' ἄριστος | ὀκτώ τ', 13/4). Cf. δὸς δ' εὔφρονι θυμῶι | μέτρ' ἥβης τελέσαντ' ἔργματα σωφροσύνης, Thgn.1325/6. Cf. also Arist.*Pol.*1335^b32; 1336^b37. The doctrine is adapted in Hp.*Hebd.*5 (West, *CQ* 21, 1971, 369). For Latin imitations see West's *apparatus* following Solon's text. Cf. also ἔργα νέων, βουλαὶ δὲ μέσων, εὐχαὶ δὲ γερόντων, Hes.*fr.*321 M.-W., referred to as a παροιμία.

Many passages associate courage (or recklessness) with youth: παῖς δ' ἐμὸς τάδ' οὐ κατειδὼς ἤνυσεν νέωι θράσει, A.*Pers.*744 (cf. Pl.*Lg.*698e); πῶς οὖν ἔτ' ἂν γένοιτ' ἂν ἰσχυρὰ πόλις, | ὅταν τις ὡς λειμῶνος ἠρινοῦ στάχυν | τόλμας ἀφαιρῆι κἀπολωτίζηι νέους; E.*Suppl.*447-9. Cf. also characteristic portrayals such as: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀφίκοντο, εὐθὺς μὲν θρασυνόμενοί τινες τῶν νέων προσέβαλλον πρὸς τὸ χωρίον, καὶ ἐποίησαν μὲν οὐδέν, τραύματα δὲ λαβόντες ἀπῆλθον, X.*HG* 2.4.2. Pericles, in the words of Thucidides, regards strict education of young children—as practiced by the Spartans—as a training concerned with τὸ ἀνδρεῖον: καὶ ἐν ταῖς παιδείαις οἱ μὲν ἐπιπόνωι ἀσκήσει εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες τὸ ἀνδρεῖον μετέρχονται, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀνειμένως διαιτώμενοι οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἐπὶ τοὺς ἰσοπαλεῖς κινδύνους χωροῦμεν, Th.2.39. Plato, of course, polemizes against the general accepted opinion that youths (like, e.g., lions) are courageous, as he makes a sharp distinction between courage and fearlessness, knowledge being the distinctive factor (*Lach.*196e ff.; cf. *R.*430b, *Lg.*963e, etc.). But especially from the fact that he denies courage to youths and lions alike (in *Lach.*196e), it is clear that the association of courage with youth was a general accepted point of view. Youths are impulsive and their temper is changeable (Pl.*Ep.*7.328b, 339c, *Lg.*929c); their nature is διάπυρος (Pl.*Lg.*664e)[92].

---

92 "Whatever else it may become, *sophrosyne* throughout Greek literature is always the virtue proper to the young", H. North, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature*, Ithaca 1966, 131, n. 24. Such associations can be

In order to become 'outstanding' among one's fellow men one has to give proof of one's ἀρεταί by means of πεῖρα. This 'testing' has to take place in the context of one's age peers. Since there is an ἀρετά characteristic of each age, one has to give proof of new ἀρεταί as one grows older. This is what φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον (75) refers to: the awareness of the limitations set upon one by one's age, which implies the need to prove oneself again and again, for new ἀρεταί. This is both a limitation and a privilege. Every age brings obligations, but the obligations can be seen as opportunities. See further interpretation, pp. 218-20 above.

• (4) *Semantics:* Transitive ἐλαύνω/**ἐλάω** means 'set in motion, spur on.' It often refers to the act of 'driving in front of oneself.'

For Pindar cf. ἷκεν δὲ Μιδέαθεν cτρατὸν ἐλαύνων, *O.*10.66; ὀρθὰc δ' αὔλακαc ἐντανύcαιc | ἤλαυν', *P.*4.227/8 (*sc.* βόαc, 225); βόαc ... ἀπριάταc ἔλαcεν, *fr.*169.6-8; ἐφορμαθεὶc δ' ἄρ' ἄκοντι θοῶι, | ἤλαcε Λυγκέοc ἐν πλευραῖcι χαλκόν, *N.*10.69/70. Also with an inanimate subject: ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖc οὖροc | πάνταc ἀνθρώπουc ἐπαΐccων ἐλαύνει, *I.*4.5/6. In καὶ τίc ἄνδραc ἀλκίμουc | δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνώναc ἔλαcεν, *N.*5.15/6, the fact that the verb refers to the act of 'driving out,' i.e., 'banishing,' is made explicit by the context (cf. also *Il.*6.158, E.*Med.*70, etc.).

The verb may be used metaphorically with objects that are not literally susceptible of motion. In those cases the subject of the verb is in some way or another the origin or instigation of the object.

An illuminating example of this is: Ἰλίωι δὲ κῆδοc[93] ὀρθώνυμον τελεccίφρων | Μῆνιc ἤλαcεν, A.*Ag.*699-701, see also Fraenkel *ad loc.* (II, pp. 334/5). There is one Pindaric example of this: Ἀκτιc ἀελίου, τί πολύcκοπε μήcεαι, | ὦ μάτερ ὀμμάτων, ἄcτρον ὑπέρτατον | ἐν ἁμέραι κλεπτόμενον; ⟨τί δ'⟩ ἔθηκαc ἀμάχανον | ἰcχύν ⟨τ'⟩ ἀνδράcι καὶ coφίαc ὁδόν, | ἐπίcκοτον ἀτραπὸν ἐccυμένα; | ἐλαύνειc τι νεώτερον ἢ πάροc, *Pae.*9.1-6. Cf. also ἀλλ' εἰc τοῦτ' ἀφῖχθε μωρίαc ἢ παρανοίαc ἢ οὐκ ἔχω τί λέγω· πολλάκιc γὰρ ἔμοιγ' ἐπελήλυθε καὶ τοῦτο φοβεῖcθαι, μή τι δαιμόνιον τὰ πράγματ' ἐλαύνηι, D.9.54 (cit. Fraenkel). It is illuminating to compare also expressions like πρᾶγμα ... θεήλατον, S.*OT* 255; θεήλατον μάντευμα, *ibid.*992.

In a number of cases the verb is used metaphorically in the sense of 'afflicting,' as in ἐλᾶι γὰρ αὐτὸν τῆιδε θἠμέραι μόνηι | δίαc Ἀθάναc μῆνιc,

---

descriptive or norminative. A certain virtue may be associated with a certain age either because it is especially vigorous in that age, or because it compensates the virtue that is especially vigorous in that age. cωφροcύνη is the vitue *proper* to the young, because by nature they excell in courage and boldness. In X.*Cyr.*1.2.8 young boys learn *sophrosyne* from imitating their elders. In X.*Mem.*1.2.26 Socrates is said to have taught Alcibiades and Critias *sophrosyne* in their youth when they otherwise might have been unrestrained. Similarly, Isoc.9.22 mentions *sophrosyne* as one of the virtues of Evagoras' childhood, exactly because it is an unnatural virtue to possess for a child.

[93] Ἐπειδὴ τὸ κῆδοc cημαίνει καὶ τὴν ἐπιγαμβρίαν καὶ τὸ πένθοc, Σ.*ad loc.* "Eh' und Weh", H. Voss.

S.*Aj*.756/7, of Athene's wrath (i.e. Ajax' madness) 'setting' Ajax 'in motion,' 'determining' his behaviour, afflicting him; κἀμὲ μὲν δαίμων ἐλᾶι, S.*Aj*.504; cf. also *ibid*.275. In ἐν δ' ὁ πυρφόρος θεὸς | σκήψας ἐλαύνει, λοιμὸς ἔχθιστος, πόλιν, | ὑφ' οὗ κενοῦται δῶμα Καδμεῖον, μέλας δ' | Ἅιδης στεναγμοῖς καὶ γόοις πλουτίζεται, S.*OT* 27/8, the choice of verb may be motivated by the fact that the plague 'drives' the city (i.e., its inhabitants) away to the underworld; the idea of the city having been 'set in motion' has been expressed in lines 22-4. Similarly, Ἰωνίαν τε πᾶσαν ἤλασεν βίαι, A.*Pers*.771, may refer to the people of Ionia being driven away by force into slavery, or the like.

Here ἐλᾶι may be taken as "a milder instance of the use of ἐλαύνειν in the sense of 'spur on, set in motion',"[94] as in A.*Ag*.701, *Pae*.9.6, and D.9.54 cited above. This would imply that 'mortal life' is in some way or another the starting-point, origin or instigation of the four virtues. The association of three of the four ἀρεταί with the three consecutive periods of life does in fact give rise to this image. The course of human life in a way 'produces' these three ἀρεταί. Moreover, Farnell and Fraenkel[95] may be right in suggesting that we might be meant to think of a four-horse chariot. The association of a four-in-hand may be evoked by the combination of the verb with the number four (cf. ἅρμα ... τετράορον, *P*.10.65; *N*.7.93). Thus we get the picture of the four virtues, like horses, drawing the chariot of life and making life to proceed in the right direction.

Cf. τῶι σὺ μάλ' ἐγχρίμψας ἐλάειν σχεδὸν ἅρμα καὶ ἵππους, *Il*.23.334; ἡνίοχοι δ' ἔμπλην ἔλασαν καλλίτριχας ἵππους, Hes.*Sc*.372; ἵππους μὲν ἤλαυν' ἐς τελευταίαν φλόγα | Ἥλιος, E.*Ion*.1148/9; ἵππους γ' ἐλαύνων ἐξέπεσον νὴ τοὺς θεούς, Ar.*Nub*.1272, etc.

Fraenkel (*loc. cit.*) may be right in arguing that in ἀμπελίδος ὄρχον ἐλάσαι, Ar.*Ach*.995, cited by LSJ (*s.v.* ἐλαύνω, III 2) as a parallel to *h.l.* and as meaning 'plant, produce', the verb refers to the 'drawing' of rows, like in *Il*.11.68 (cf. also *P*.4.228, cited above; Hes.*Op*.443).

The noun **αἰών** means 'life,' viewed as a time span, so 'life span, course of life.' The choice of the noun here is understandable as the preceding lines do indeed describe life in terms of a time span, consisting of three consecutive periods. For αἰών conceived of as an external power or as an active influence on a man's fortunes, cf. *N*.2.8 (cf. also Heracl.*fr*. B 52).

Cf. τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων | ἕκαλος ἔπειμι γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον | αἰῶνα, *I*.7.40-2, where the noun has a purely quantitative sense. Cf. also μεταμειβόμενοι δ' ἐναλλὰξ ἁμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ πατρὶ φίλωι | Δὶ νέμονται,

---

[94] Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.701 (II, p. 335).

[95] Fraenkel on A.*Ag*.701 (II, p. 335, n. 1), following J.D. Beazley. Cf. also Bury *ad loc.* (p. 59), translating 'but life drives a team of four excellences' and explaining: "the metaphor in ἐλᾶι, I think, is from driving, not from planting".

τὰν δ' ὑπὸ κεύθεϲι γαίαϲ ἐν γυάλοιϲ Θεράπναϲ, | πότμον ἀμπιπλάντεϲ ὁμοῖον· ἐπεὶ | τοῦτον, ἢ πάμπαν θεὸϲ ἔμμεναι οἰκεῖν τ' οὐρανῶι | εἵλετ' αἰῶνα φθιμένου Πολυδεύκηϲ Κάϲτοροϲ ἐν πολέμωι, *N.*10.55-9, describing Polydeuces' life as a time span consisting of alternating periods. Cf. also *O.*2.10, 67, *O.*9.60, *P.*4.186, *P.*5.7, *P.*8.97, *N.*2.8, *N.*9.44, *fr.*131b.2, *fr.*165. As the noun regards life as a time span, it is often used in statements about the unstable conditions of human life and the changes occasioned by fate, as in: αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναιϲ ἁμέραιϲ ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξάλλαξεν, *I.*3.18; αἰὼν δ' ἀϲφαλὴϲ | οὐκ ἔγεντ', *P.*3.86/7; δόλιοϲ γὰρ αἰὼν ἐπ' ἀνδράϲι κρέμαται, | ἑλίϲϲων βίου πόρον, *I.*8.14/5, where βίου πόρον, 'course of life,' may be said to paraphraze αἰών.

On αἰών see further: E. Degani, *ΑΙΩΝ da Omero ad Aristotele*, Padova 1961, 45-51; *RFIC* 91, 1963, 104-10; Fraenkel on A.*Ag.*105/6 (II, pp. 62/3); H. Fränkel, 'Die Zeitauffassung in der archaischen griechischen Literatur', *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik* 25, 1931, Beilageheft, p. 114; Wilamowitz on E.*Her.*669, and *Aischylos Interpretationen*, Berlin 1914, p. 170, n. 3.

For some general observations on the semantics of **ἀρετά** see my note on *N.*5.53 (pp. 188-90).

Pythian VIII

*P.*8.7 καιρόϲ

The semantics of καιρόϲ form one of the most controversial areas of Pindaric scholarship. A select list of references, representing a variety of dissenting views, is given below. My view can be summarized in three points. First, καιρόϲ does not mean 'due measure,' suggesting (quantitative) moderation.[96] Second, it is not the case that in Pindar καιρόϲ is either an exclusively local or an exclusively temporal notion.[97] Third, καιρόϲ is a relative notion, referring to a point, either in time or in space, that is the 'right point' (i.e, 'right moment,' or 'right spot') in that it is pertinent to the aims one wishes to accomplish. One must seize καιρόϲ in order to achieve one's goal;

---

[96] Cf. Sicking, *Mnemosyne* 16, 1963, 232-4. Burton (*Pythian Odes*, pp. 46/7) takes καιρόϲ to be a quantative concept which refers to "distinguishing the exact line between the too much and the too little"; "the selection of καιρόϲ is like knowing how to discern the exact line of equilibrium in a pair of scales" (p. 47). Carey, *Five Odes*, accepts this interpretation for *P.*9.78/9. On the relation between καιρόϲ and μέτρον see below.

[97] Thus, *i.a.*, Sicking, *Mnemosyne* 16, 1963, 232-4; Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 89, who observes that "clearly the context is of paramount importance in deciding the precise value of the word." Fränkel (*Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 509, n. 14), Burton (*Pythian Odes*, pp. 46/7), and Bundy (*Studia Pindarica*, I, p. 18 n. 44) insist that καιρόϲ in Pindar is always spatial ('right point'), and never temporal ('right moment'). The temporal application of the concept is dominant in later Greek. Cf. καιρόϲ· χρόνου ἀκμὴ πρὸϲ τὸ ϲυμφέρον, Pl.*Def.*414a.

missing καιρός is missing the opportunity to accomplish what one wishes to accomplish.[98]

In some contexts the spatial connotations of καιρός ('exactly the right spot for one's purposes') are being evoked.

τὸ καίριον denotes the spot where one is to hit one's enemy if one wishes to subdue him, as there the wound will be lethal. Cf. οὐκ ἐν καιρίωι ὀξὺ πάγη βέλος, ἀλλὰ πάροιθεν | εἰρύσατο ζωστήρ τε παναίολος ἠδ' ὑπένερθε | ζῶμά τε καὶ μίτρη, τὴν χαλκῆες κάμον ἄνδρες, *Il*.4.185-7; ἀλλ' ἵππος ἐτείρετο, τὸν βάλεν ἰῶι | δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος ... | ἄκρην κὰκ κορυφήν, ὅθι τε πρῶται τρίχες ἵππων | κρανίωι ἐμπεφύασι, μάλιστα δὲ καίριόν ἐστιν, *Il*.8.81-4; ἤτοι ὁ μὲν φαρέτρης ἐξείλετο πικρὸν ὀϊστόν, | θῆκε δ' ἐπὶ νευρῆι· τὸν δ' αὖ κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ | αὐερύοντα παρ' ὦμον, ὅθι κληῒς ἀποέργει | αὐχένα τε στῆθός τε, μάλιστα δὲ καίριόν ἐστι, *Il*.8.323-6. Cf. also καὶ γλῶσσα τοξεύσασα μὴ τὰ καίρια, A.*Supp*.446, where καίρια is in keeping with the terminology of the *vehicle*.

The (probably original) spatial connotation of καιρός, 'vital spot, mark,'[99] underlies the imagery in Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι | τὸν τάδε πράξαντ', ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρωι | τείνοντα πάλαι τόξον, ὅπως ἂν | μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄστρων | βέλος ἠλίθιον σκήψειεν, A.*Ag*.362-6 (πρὸ καιροῦ of a missile falling short of the mark); τοιγὰρ τὰ μὲν δόξαντα δηλώσω, σὺ δὲ | ὀξεῖαν ἀκοὴν τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις διδούς, | εἰ μή τι καιροῦ τυγχάνω, μεθάρμοσον, S.*El*.29-31. Cf. Pl.*Lg*.687a.

This usage occurs once in Pindar: Ὥρα πότνια, κάρυξ Ἀφροδίτας | ἀμβροσιᾶν φιλοτάτων, | ἅ τε παρθενηΐοις παίδων τ' ἐφίζοισα γλεφάροις, | τὸν μὲν ἁμέροις ἀνάγκας χερσὶ βαστάζεις, ἕτερον δ' ἑτέραις. | ἀγαπατὰ δὲ καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον | τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν δύνασθαι, *N*.8.1-5, where (notwithstanding the temporal connotations of Ὥρα, παρθενηΐοις, and παίδων) πλαναθέντα strongly evokes spatial connotations of καιρός: 'sweet it is without missing the mark in any effort to be able to win the better desires.'[100] πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον suggests a wider application than the purely erotic.[101] "Hora may be gentle or violent accordingly as she inspires noble or base desires" (Carey, *PCPhS*, 22, 1976, 27). The phrase 'without missing the mark,' then, relates to the momentum of choice implied in the two kinds of desire, and refers to what is pertinent to attaining the 'better desires.'

Some contexts specifically focus upon the temporal implication of καιρός ('exactly the right time for one's purposes').

---

[98] Cf. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 509 n. 14: "u.a. der Sinn für das jeweils den Umstanden Angemessene." Cf. also Sicking, *Mnemosyne* 16, 1963, 232-4.

[99] Cf. Onians, *Origin of European Thought*, pp. 343ff.

[100] Carey, *PCPhS*, 22, 1976, 27. Puech (*ad loc*, p. 110), Bowra (*Pindar*, p. 170), and LSJ give καιρός a temporal sense here.

[101] Although ἔργον is in itself not inapplicable to sex (cf., e.g., *Od*.11.246, Sol.*fr*.28). The spatial connotations of καιρός are in fact not unfunny in combination with a purely erotic interpretation of these lines.

Cf. χρὴ μὲν κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρώτων δρέπεϲθαι, θυμέ, ϲὺν ἁλικίαι, *fr.*123.1, where the phrase ϲὺν ἁλικίαι defines κατὰ καιρόν. Cf. also εἴη καὶ ἐρᾶν καὶ ἔρωτι | χαρίζεϲθαι κατὰ καιρόν· | μὴ πρεϲβυτέραν ἀριθμοῦ | δίωκε, θυμέ, πρᾶξιν, *fr.*127; δοιὰ βοῶν | θερμὰ πρὸϲ ἀνθρακιὰν | ϲτρέψαν, πυρὶ δ' ὤπτων | ϲώματα· καὶ τότ' ἐγὼ | ϲαρκῶν τ' ἐνοπὰν ⟨ἴδον⟩[102] ἠδ' ὀϲτέων ϲτεναγμὸν βαρύν· | ἦν διακρῖναι ἰδόντ' ⟨οὐ⟩[103] πολλὸϲ ἐν καιρῶι χρόνοϲ, *fr.*168b; *P.*4.286 (see below). In οὕτω δ' Ἱέρωνι θεὸϲ ὀρθωτὴρ πέλοι | τὸν προϲέρποντα χρόνον, ὧν ἔραται καιρὸν διδούϲ, *P.*1.56/7, the preceding reference to χρόνοϲ evokes the temporal connotations of καιρόϲ. ὀρθωτήρ probably implies a change for the better, which could be referred to Hieron's illness.[104] Then καιρόϲ refers to the better times that are to come, which are the 'right season' for accomplishing what Hieron wishes.

In most passages, however, the context does not specify καιρόϲ as either a local or a temporal notion. In such passages καιρόϲ denotes the opportune, the expedient, referring to what is (in the given circumstances) exactly right in relation to one's aims and purposes.

In εἰ δέ τιϲ ἀρκέων φίλοιϲ | ἐχθροῖϲι τραχὺϲ ὑπαντιάζει, | μόχθοϲ ἡϲυχίαν φέρει καιρῶι καταβαίνων, *Pae.*2.31-4, 'effort that enters the contest[105] with καιρόϲ,' καιρόϲ could have temporal connotations ("'die Mühe die zur rechten Zeit eintrifft', eine treffende Bezeichnung für die einer weit entfernten Stadt wie Teos geleistete Hilfe," Radt, *Zweiter und sechster Paian*, p. 42), although there is nothing in the context that makes it necessary to take καιρόϲ as specific as that.[106] The preceding εἰ-clause describes the purpose of the μόχθοϲ: aiding friends against enemies. καιρῶι specifies the μόχθοϲ as pertinent to that purpose, tying it in with effectiveness in the present circumstance: 'effort that enters the contest on exactly the right place and time in order to accomplish its purpose,' which concurs with 'effort that comes opportunely.'

In ὁ μὰν πλοῦτοϲ ἀρεταῖϲ δεδαιδαλμένοϲ φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν | καιρόν, *O.*2.53/4, it is clear that καιρόϲ is neither spatial nor temporal. καιρόϲ is relative to what one wishes to achieve; it refers to the 'opportunity, prospect, chance' of achieving them. The genitive adnominal constituent τῶν τε καὶ τῶν defines the aims to which καιρόϲ is pertinent. 'Wealth adorned with qualities is constitutive of the opportunity of achieving several things.' In τυχεῖν δ' ἕν' ἀδύνατον | εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπαϲαν ἀνελόμενον· οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, τίνι τοῦτο Μοῖρα τέλοϲ ἔμπεδον ὤρεξε. Θεαρίων, τὶν δ' ἐοικότα καιρὸν ὄλβου | δίδωϲι, τόλμαν τε καλῶν ἀρομένωι | ϲύνεϲιν οὐκ ἀποβλάπτει φρενῶν, *N.*7.55-60, the genitive ὄλβου is defining (καιρόϲ consiting of ὄλβοϲ). The idea is comparable to *O.*2.53/4.

---

[102] Schroeder: ⟨κλύον⟩ Snell.

[103] Coraës: ἰδόντα codd. ἰδ. διακρ. codd.: transp. Bergk.

[104] Thus, e.g., Schroeder *ad loc.*

[105] For καταβαίνων see my note on line 78 below (pp. 654-9).

[106] Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 509 n. 14, gives 'mit richtiger Wahl eingreifend.' It is true that in many passages καιρόϲ evokes connotations of 'making the right choice,' but the idea of a choice does not reside in καιρόϲ itself, but rather in whether one seizes καιρόϲ or not.

In οὐκ ἐμέμφθη | ῥυςίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός, | τὰν Νικόμαχος κατὰ καιρὸν νεῖμ' ἁπάςαις ἀνίαις, *I*.2.20-2, κατὰ καιρόν qualifies the charioteer's way of handling the reigns. It will be clear that he did this 'exactly right,' as victories were the result. More specifically, he did it exactly right in relation to the aims and purposes of both himself and his employer to whose palmares the victoires were added.

In: ἔνθα (Aegina) Cώτειρα Διὸς ξενίου | πάρεδρος ἀςκεῖται Θέμις | ἔξοχ' ἀνθρώπων. ὅ τι γὰρ πολὺ καὶ πολλᾶι ῥέπηι, | ὀρθᾶι διακρίνειν φρενὶ μὴ παρὰ καιρὸν | δυςπαλές, *O*.8.21-5, μὴ παρὰ καιρόν relates to making exactly the right decision in a situation in which 'the balance is heavy and heavily sways.'[107] διακρίνειν refers to the act of deciding, ὀρθᾶι ... φρενί to the condition for making the right decision, μὴ παρὰ καιρόν qualifies the act of deciding as aiming at exactly the desired result, viz. exactly the right decision in the given circumstances.

Although a certain degree of conceptual affinity may be (and has in fact been) felt between καιρός and μέτρον, the two notions are, in the end, definitely distinct. μέτρον is 'full measure,' conjuring up 'repleteness' and implying a maximum; it often envisages an (imaginary) boundary: 'more is too much.' (see my note on line 78 below, pp. 659-62). καιρός denotes the expedient. Whereas μέτρον focusses upon a limit, καιρός refers to what is exactly right in relation to one's aims and purposes. The relation between the two concepts can be clarified with the help of the following passages.

In οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει, *P*.4.286, μακύνων evokes the temporal connotations of both μέτρον and καιρός. μέτρον refers to a temporal 'measure': 'compass, space' (cf. *I*.1.60-3). The καιρός 'goes in very small measures,' so to speak. One quickly reaches the point that waiting longer means having waited for too long, so as to have missed the opportunity to effect one's τέλος.

In ἕπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάςτωι | μέτρον· νοῆςαι δὲ καιρὸς ἄριςτος, *O*.13.47/8, the gnomes are part of a transitional passage. They are the motivation for a 'break off' of the common type 'too much to tell', following a lengthy victory catalogue. μέτρον has reference to the 'full measure' of praise, implying the idea 'more is too much'. The following assertion, then, about καιρός being best to keep in mind, specifies that, in this context, the limit implied by μέτρον ties in with effectiveness in the present circumstance: 'now, more would be too much, for ineffective; going on telling about the victor's achievements would overshoot the mark and not be pertinent to my aims.'

The famous Hesiod line that is echoed by *O*.13.47/8, μέτρα φυλάςςεςθαι· καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶςιν ἄριςτος, Hes.*Op*.694, is to be interpreted along the same lines. Taking καιρός to be eqivalent to 'due measure' or 'moderation,'[108] results in spiceless redundancy. The particle δ' sets off

---

[107] Transl. Bowra (*Odes*, p. 211).

[108] Thus, e.g., Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 89: "This gnome is then equivalent to μηδὲν ἄγαν, and καιρός to 'moderation'."

the second sentence as an independent, new step in the sequence. The advice Hesiod gives us is to 'heed the full measures' of everything, i.e., to be careful not to want too much of anything, and, secondly, to keep in mind that 'effectiveness' in the light of one's aims and purposes is the key.

The concept καιρός occurs several times in contexts in which Pindar deals with his own compositional strategy. It is thus used especially in break off passages. In such contexts καιρός refers to what is 'expedient' from the poet's point of view, the criterium being effectiveness in the light of the encomastic aims of his odes.

In ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων, | μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία, πατρὸς δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνὸς | ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει. | τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν; ἀλλά με Πυθώ τε καὶ τὸ Πελινναῖον ἀπύει | Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες, Ἱπποκλέαι θέλοντες | ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα. | γεύεται γὰρ ἀέθλων, *P.*10.1-7, the poet's question to himself, τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν; is a 'break off' formula effecting a transition from the introductory lines to the praise of the victor (cf. *N.*3.26/7, with my notes, pp. 302-4): 'Why do I utter this loud praise inopportunely?' In keeping with the familar fictional mimesis of ex tempore speech (see introduction, pp. 35/6), Pindar pretends that his opening lines are a false start, irrelevant to his present purpose. His κομπεῖν is παρὰ καιρόν because it does not pertain to his present encomiastic purposes in their narrowest sense, as the lines following the question specify (4-7).[109]

In ἀπό μοι λόγον | τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον· | ἐπεὶ τό γε λοιδορῆσαι θεοὺς | ἐχθρὰ σοφία, καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν | μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει. | μὴ νῦν λαλάγει τὰ τοιαῦτ'· ἔα πόλεμον μάχαν τε πᾶσαν | χωρὶς ἀθανάτων· φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας | ἄστει γλῶσσαν κτλ, *O.*9.35-42, the gnome τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν | μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει is part of the motivation of the break off of the story of Heracles' battle with the gods. The break off is motivated in terms of this story not being 'opportune' in that it is not a morally good story to tell (again, the presentation is fictional; cf. *N.*5.14-8, with my notes, p. 117). It does not concur with καιρός because it is not pertinent to the aims of the ode. For καιρός in break off passages, cf. also *O.*13.47/8 (quoted above).

In καιρὸν εἰ φθέγξαιο, πολλῶν πείρατα συντανύσαις | ἐν βραχεῖ, μείων ἕπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων· ἀπὸ γὰρ κόρος ἀμβλύνει | αἰανὴς ταχείας ἐλπίδας· | ἀστῶν δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει μάλιστ' ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις, *P.*1.81-4, the implications are slightly different. Here καιρός contrasts μῶμος and κόρος. 'Reproach' and 'tedium' are notoriously dangerous side-effects of encomiastic poetry: too explicit or too lengthy praise is bound to cause envy and tedium on the part of the audience. This is the

[109] Cf. Burton, *Pythian Odes*, pp. 2-4. Krikwood *ad loc* argues against a break off being implied here, because the praise of Thessaly is not in fact irrelevant; this fails to appreciate the fictional nature of such break offs. It is worth noticing that the two lines preceding the break off do not really add up to a particularly lengthy passage, which makes it difficult to defend a quantitative meaning of καιρός ('due measure') here.

point at which the encomiastic poet overshoots the mark, and his words of praise turn against the *laudandus*. Pindar is conscious of this danger (cf. lines 29-32 below, with my note, pp. 510/1; *O*.2.95-8, *N*.7.52, *N*.10.20, *P*.7.19, etc.). Thus καιρόϲ again refers to what is effective in the light of the encomiastic purposes of the ode; πολλῶν πείρατα ϲυντανύϲαιϲ | ἐν βραχεῖ defines the way in which these can be accomplished. If one wishes to praise someone, one must be careful to say exactly the right thing, i.e., what is exactly expedient: one should not present lengthy passages of exalted praise, for these will prove counter-productive, but one should briefly touch upon many things: then one's praise will not cause envy and offense, and have the desired effect.

In ἀρεταὶ δ' ἀεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι· | βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖϲι ποικίλλειν | ἀκοὰ ϲοφοῖϲ· ὁ δὲ καιρὸϲ ὁμοίωϲ παντὸϲ ἔχει κορυφάν, *P*.9.76-9, καιρόϲ represents the criterium for choosing between either one of the preceding options: on the one hand, 'glorious achievements are always rich in tale,' on the other hand, 'to tell skilfully a short tale where a long tale might be told is an offering fit for a cultured audience.'[110] Thus for an encomiastic poet there are two alternative ways of responding to marvellous exploits: the natural way is to tell a lot about them; compression is what the ϲοφοί in the audience like. καιρόϲ is the way out of the dilemma. To choose what is pertinent to one's purposes is best in song as in all else. Cf. also πῶϲ ϲε ϲεβίζω | μήθ' ὑπεράραϲ μήθ' ὑποκάμψαϲ | καιρὸν χάριτοϲ; A.*Ag*.785-7, asked by the chorus at the King's entry upon the stage.

Slightly different is πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλών, *N*.1.18. πολλῶν ... καιρόν is the object of ἐπέβαν; it is to be supplied as the object of βαλών: 'I have embarked upon the καιρόϲ for many things, not striking it with falsehood.'[111] This is a complimetary reference to the richness of themes Pindar has at his disposal, combined with the assertion that he deals with them in accordance with the truth. The line forms the transition from praise of Sicily, the victor's home town (13-8) to praise of the victor himself (19ff.).[112] Pindar suggests that his present assignment gives him the opportunity of dealing with plentiful marvellous material, as there is very much praiseworthy about both Sicily and the victor. καιρόϲ

[110] These lines are subject to much dispute. Above all, the misconception that ϲοφοῖϲ must necessarily refer to 'poets' has caused much confusion. But cf. *P*.1.84, *O*.2.86 (with *CPh* 89, 1994, 311-3). My interpretation follows Carey, *Five Odes*, pp. 88/9. Further references are to be found there.

[111] For ἐπιβαίνω with the acc. in this metaphorical sense, cf. *O*.2.95, *O*.7.45. The alternative is to take πολλῶν with ἐπέβαν, καιρόν with βαλών (thus Braswell *ad loc.*, p. 45, quoting *Od*.22.424, 23.52, *h.Merc*.166 as parallels to the verb with the genitive). The seperation of καιρόν from πολλῶν seems unnatural. There is, however, not much difference in sense as far as καιρόϲ is concerned.

[112] With this line of interpretation, the past reference of ἐπέβαν derives its relevance from the fact that Pindar envisages the moment in the past on which he 'embarked' upon his present assignment, i.e., the moment he got it, or, alternatively, in keeping with the common fiction of extemporizing composition, the moment on which the performance of this ode begun.

here refers to the 'opportunity, prospect, chance' of telling (praising) many things (cf. *O.*2.53/4, *N.*7.55-60, cited above).

• *Literature:* The literature on the semantics of καιρόϲ is extensive; the following is a selection, representing a variety of dissenting views: Barrett on E.*Hipp.*386-7 (p. 231); Burton, *Pythian Odes*, pp. 45-9; G. Brancato, 'Il fren dell' arte in Pindaro', *Quattro note di filologia classica*, Messina & Florence 1960, pp. 47-63; Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, I, p. 18 n. 14; Carey, *Five Odes*, p. 89; Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 509, n. 14; B. Gallet, *Recherches sur Kairos et l'ambiguïté dans la poésie de Pindare*, Talence 1990; Onians, *Origin of European Thought*, pp. 343 ff.; L.R. Palmer, 'The Indo-European Origins of Greek Justice', *TPS*, 1950, 149-68; Race, *TAPhA* 111, 1981, 197-213; Sicking, *Mnemosyne* 16, 1963, 232-4; Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars*, pp. 104-105; M. Trede, *Καιρόϲ : l'à-propos et l'occasion*, Diss. Paris 1987; M. Treu, *Von Homer zur Lyrik*, (*Zetemata* 12), München 1955, p. 224; M. Untersteiner, *La formazione poetica di Pindaro*, Messina & Firenze 1951, pp. 35-45, 65-102; W. Vollgraff, *L'Oraison Funèbre de Gorgias*, Leiden 1952, pp. 21 ff; H. Wersdörfer, *Die* φιλοϲοφία *des Isokrates im Spiegel ihrer Terminologie*, Leipzig 1940, pp. 62ff.; J.R. Wilson, '*Kairos* as "Due Measure"', *Glotta* 58, 1980, 177-204.

*P.*8.78. μέτρωι καταβαίνει

• *Text; Overview:* The text is uncertain on two points. First, some mss. have μέτρωι (BFG^{i}H^{i}), some μέτρον (VEG^{s}H^{γρ}). The authority of the mss. does not decisively tip the balance one way or the other.[113] However, μέτρον is dubious because of the ensuing ambiguities: if we read μέτρον, it would best be interpreted as the object of καταβαίνει; but the linear percipient of these lines could easily be tempted to take μέτρον with the two ἄλλον's (or just with the second) in the preceding verse, which hardly gives sense. Moreover, μέτρον could also be interpreted as a nominative, as the subject of καταβαίνει, which could perhaps make sense, but which, if this was what Pindar wrote and how he intended it to be interpreted, would be an awkward expression precisely because it could, then, easily be mistaken for an accusative. μέτρωι, on the other hand, is syntactically unambiguous.

The second point of textual uncertainty is that καταβαίνει ἐν Μεγάροιϲ, found in all mss., is one syllable too long. The *hiatus* locates the corruption. Three sollutions have been proposed: (1)

[113] The fact that G and H have both variants is a probable sign of variants in their exemplar γ. These variants were also in β (the source of γ); E and F, descending from β, have each made a different choice out of the two. This makes it likely that also *v*, the archetype of the *recensio Vaticana*, had the two variants, and it cannot be excluded that the variants were also in α, the common archetype of *v* and ζ, from which V descends.

Keeping ἐν and reading κατάβαιν' (Bergk, followed by Turyn, Gildersleeve, Christ, Puech, Farnell, Bowra). This presupposes that a scribe or scholiast spelled out the ending, wrongly taking it as a third person indicative (for changes of this type in the inflection of verbs, see Young, 'Scribal Error', pp. 114/5; for errors of non-elision see p. 116). The subject of the imperative, then, is the victor, addressed in the next sentence in the second person. So with this reading we ought to punctuate heavily after χειρῶν. (2) Deleting ἐν (Snell-Maehler). This presupposes that ἐν was inserted (or crept in from the margin as a glosse) because the locative was not understood (for this common addition of ἐν see Young, 'Scribal Error', p. 105). Then, the δαίμων is the subject of καταβαίνει. So we ought to print a comma after χειρῶν and a full stop after the verb. (3) Deleting ἐν and reading καταβαίνειν (Bergk). This presupposes that -NEIN was misread as -NEIEN (for this type of minor dittography see Young, 'Scribal Error', p. 99). The infinitive, then, is either *pro imperativo*, with the same implications for the punctuation as (1), or depending on παρίcχει (cf. S.*Tr.*1114, Th.1.37), in which case we must punctuate as with (2).

A detailed inquiry into the semantics of the two words involved must precede an evaluation of the textual difficulties.

• *Semantics:* **καταβαίνω** denotes 'going down.' The (higher) point of departure can be referred to by a prepositional phrase (ἐκ or ἀπό), a noun with the -θεν suffix, or a bare genitive; the (lower) point of destination is as a rule referred to by a εἰc or ἐπί phrase.

Cf. Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε Παρναccοῦ καταβάντε | δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, *O.*9.43/4; πρώιραθεν Εὔφαμοc καταβαίc, *P.*4.22; οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοὺc | Ἠέλιοc φαέθων ἐπιδέρκεται ἀκτίνεccιν | οὐρανὸν εἰcανιὼν οὐδ' οὐρανόθεν καταβαίνων, Hes.*Th.*759-61; οὐρανόθεν καταβάc, *Il.*11.184 (cf. *Il.*17.545, *Od.*6.281, etc.); τῆc ἀκροπόλιοc καταβάντα, Hdt.1.84; βαρὺ δέ cφιν | νεῖκοc Ἀχιλεὺc | ἔμπεcε χαμαὶ καταβαὶc ἀφ' ἁρμάτων, *N.*6.50/1 (cf. *Il.*5.109, Hdt.9.76, etc.); εἰc Ἀΐδα δόμον ... κατέβα, *P.*3.11 (cf. ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἐκτελέcαι κατέβη δόμον Ἄϊδοc εἴcω, Thgn.917; cf. *ibid.*974, 1014, *Od.*23.252, Hdt.2.122; S.*Ant.*822, etc.). The sea and coastal areas are lower than the inland: ἐξιέναι ἐκ τῆc χώρηc [καὶ] καταβῆναι ἐc Cμύρνην, Hdt.1.94; ἐπὶ θάλαccαν καταβαίνοντα, Hdt.7.28 (cf. Hdt.1.154, 3.141, 6.43, 7.20, etc.); ἐνθαῦτα κατέβη αὐτὸc Ξέρξηc ἐπὶ τὰc νέαc, Hdt.8.67 (cf. Hdt.7.173). Often a city dominates the surrounding plains, which explains the verb in passages like: καλέουcιν ἄριcτοι | Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων | ἐc πεδίον καταβῆναι ἵν' ὅρκια πιcτὰ τάμητε, *Il.*3.350-2; οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν πόλιοc κατέβαν, πεδίον δ' ἀφίκοντο, *Il.*24.329; οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιοc κατέβαν, τάχα δ' ἀγρὸν ἵκοντο, *Od.*24.205, but this is of course no rule: ὡc τάχιcτα κατέβηcαν ἐc τὸ ἄcτυ, Hdt.5.29 (*sc.* to Milete, laying in the lowland close to the sea).

There is one certain example of καταβαίνω in this sense with a dative: Ἀλφεῷι μέccωι καταβαὶc ἐκάλεccε Ποcειδᾶν' εὐρυβίαν, *O.*6.58.

The verb may be used metaphorically in the sense of 'going, getting down to,' without any literal motion being implied.

As in: ἀρχόμενοc δὲ ἀπ' ἀρχῆc διεξῄιε τῆι ἀληθείηι χρεώμενοc καὶ κατέβαινε ἐc λιτάc τε καὶ cυγγνώμην ἑωυτῶι κελεύων ἔχειν αὐτόν, Hdt.1.116 (cf. 1.90, 118, 9.94); καταβαίην ἂν τῶι λόγωι ἐc τὰ θεῖα πρήγματα, Hdt.2.65; ἀρξάμενοc δὲ ἀπ' Ἀχαιμένεοc ἐγενεηλόγηcε τὴν πατριὴν τὴν Κύρου· μετὰ δέ, ὡc ἐc τοῦτον κατέβη, τελευτῶν ἔλεγε ὅcα ἀγαθὰ Κῦροc Πέρcαc πεποιήκοι, Hdt.3.75 (cf. Hdt.2.91); καταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τελευτήν, Pl.*R.*511b.

The situation is slightly more complex for καταβαίνω with a direct object. The type of thing in reality the object refers to is decisive for the precise connotations of the verb. There are a few examples of the direct object referring to the 'route' one takes while going down: 'going down along'.

Examples include: κλίμακα δ' ὑψηλὴν κατεβήcετο οἷο δόμοιο, *Od.*1.330 (Lysias says κατὰ τῆc κλίμακοc καταβαίνουcα, 1.9); ξεcτὸν ἐφόλκαιον καταβάc, *Od.*14.350. This means that the difference between οἱ δὲ κατέβαινον τὸ ὄροc κατὰ τάχοc, Hdt.7.218, and, e.g., ἐξ ὄρεοc κατεβήcετο, *Il.*13.17, is to be explained in terms of the authors' focussing upon the action of descending the mountain (cf. κατὰ τάχοc) and the point of departure respectively ('going down the mountain' *vs.* 'going down from the mountain').

However, the vast majority of examples of καταβαίνω with a direct object have in common that the object refers to the destination of the motion implied by the verb: 'going down to'. Semantic difficulties arise from the fact that it is not easy to determine for each individual example, to what extent the motion referred to by the verb involves literal descent (or was felt to involve that). Moreover, in English we use different verbs for rendering καταβαίνω, depending on the type of thing in reality the object refers to. Two groups can be discerned.

First, there are quite a few examples of καταβαίνω with a direct object referring to a building or a room, or the like. It is clear that καταβαίνω refers to the act of 'entering' in these cases (as with many verbs of motion compounded or used with κατά).

Cf. τὸν μὲν πολυχρύcωι ποτ' ἐν δώματι | Φοῖβοc ἀμνάcει θέμιccιν | Πύθιον ναὸν καταβάντα χρόνωι | ὑcτέρωι, *P.*4.53-6 (Braswell *ad loc.*, pp. 134/5, says that archaeological evidence does not support the assumption that Apollo's temple was in fact lower than the ground level); κατέβαν ... ἄλcοc Ἀπόλλωνοc, *Pae.*6.13/4; ἔνθα τότε cπεύδων κατεβήcατο λάϊνον οὐδὸν | ἄντρον ἐc ἠερόεν ἑκατηβόλοc αὐτὸc Ἀπόλλων, *h.Merc.*233/4. Thus also with ἐc: Κίρκηc ἐc μέγαρον καταβήμεναι, *Od.*10.432; αὐτὴ δ' ἐc θάλαμον κατεβήcετο κηώεντα, *Il.*6.288. Cf. also ὅθι Νύξ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἆccον ἰοῦcαι | ἀλλήλαc προcέειπον ἀμειβόμεναι μέγαν οὐδὸν | χάλκεον· ἡ μὲν ἔcω

καταβήcεται, ἡ δὲ θύραζε | ἔρχεται, οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμφοτέρας δόμος ἐντὸς ἐέργει, Hes.*Th.*748-51.

(Cf. also ἐρχόμενον κατὰ δῶμα, *Od.*17.329, 22.199; κατὰ δῶμα νέεcθαι, *Od.*22.484, θύραι ... καταιβαταὶ ἀνθρώποιcιν, *Od.*13.110, etc. Contrast: νῦν δή c' οὐκέτι καλὰ διὲκ μεγάροιο γ' ὀίω | ἂψ ἀναχωρήcειν, *Od.*17.460/1; ἐκ δὲ Μελάνθιον ἦγον ἀνὰ πρόθυρόν τε καὶ αὐλήν, *Od.*22.474; ἐκ γάρ τοι τούτων φάτιc ἀνθρώπουc ἀναβαίνει, *Od.*6.29; φέρων ἀνὰ δώματα τόξον, *Od.*22.234, etc. On the use of κατά and ἀνά in such contexts see: J.L. Myres, 'On the Plan of the Homeric House', *JHS* 20, 1900, 140-3; D. Gray, 'Houses in the Odyssey', *CQ* 5, 1955, 1-7).

Difficult is: κατέβαιν' ὑπερώϊα, *Od.*18.206, 23.85, for the ὑπερώϊα seem to be the 'upper rooms' and the context makes clear that Penelope comes down from them, instead of entering them. Probably the object refers to the 'route' Penelope takes: 'went down along, or through', as in *Od.*1.330, 14.350, Hdt.7.218 (see above; cf. Stanford on *Od.*18.206, pp. 307/8).

Second, with the object referring to geographical locations, the verb may be used in the sense of 'landing', i.e. 'arriving' at one's destination after a sea voyage[114].

Cf. ὁπᾶι πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόcτου τέλοc, *N.*3.25 (with my notes *ad loc.*, pp. 300/1). Cf. also *O.*7.13/4, *P.*3.72/3, where the object is to be supplied from the context (see below). In this sense also with a prepositional phrase: ἐc δ' Ἰαολκὸν ἐπεὶ κατέβα ναυτᾶν ἄωτοc, *P.*4.188. This usage is typically Pindaric, as the scholia remark (τὸ δὲ κατέβα ἀντὶ τοῦ κατῆλθε· καὶ πυκνῶc αὐτῶι χρῆται, τῶι καταβῆναι ἀντὶ τοῦ παραγενέcθαι, Σ. *ad P.*4.188 [334, II 134 Dr.]; cf. also Σ. *ad P.*3.73 [128, II 79 Dr.]).

When used absolutely, the verb may literaly mean 'going down', the higher point of departure and/or the lower point of destination being implied in the (textual or pragmatic) context of the utterance (as in: ἀλλ' ἐκκυκλήcομαι· καταβαίνειν δ' οὐ cχολή, Ar.*Ach.*409). Similarly, in the context of a (sea) voyage, it may mean 'landing, arriving' (καί νυν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων cὺν Διαγόραι κατέβαν, τὰν ποντίαν | ὑμνέων ... Ῥόδον, *O.*7.13/4; τῶι μὲν διδύμαc χάριταc | εἰ κατέβαν ... ἄγων, *P.*3.72/3, *sc.* to Sicily).

Absolute καταβαίνω occurs also in a specialized sense, 'stepping down into the arena, entering competition.' Cf. ἠγωνίζοντο δὲ παῖδεc ... καὶ καλὴ θέα ἐγένετο· πολλοὶ γὰρ κατέβηcαν, X.*An.*4.8.27; τῶν καταβαινόντων μεθ' ὅπλων, Pl.*Lg.*824c; ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τάνδ' ἄρ' ἄκοιτιν | ⟨τίνεc⟩ ἀμφίγυοι κατέβαν πρὸ γάμων; | τίνεc πάμπληκτα παγκόνιτά τ' ἐξῆλθον ἄεθλ' ἀγώνων; S.*Tr.*503-6. Cf. also Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ ἀεθλεύ-

---

[114] Some literal descent may still be felt in these situations, to the extent that going ashore involves descending from one's ship; cf. νῦν δ' ὧδε ξὺν νηῒ κατήλυθον ἠδ' ἑτάροιcι, *Od.*1.182; contrast: ὡc εἰπὼν ἀνὰ νηὸc ἔβην, ἐκέλευcα δ' ἑταίρουc | αὐτούc τ' ἀμβαίνειν ἀνά τε πρυμνήcια λῦcαι, *Od.*9.177/8, etc.

ειν ἑλομένου καὶ καταβάντος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἐξεῖργόν μιν, Hdt.5.22.

There is, however, no undisputed parallel to this usage in Pindar. In Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεξαν | Ἑλλανίδα στρατιὰν ὠκύτατι, *P.*11.49/50, often quoted in this connection, it is the explicit addition γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον that makes all the difference.[115] Radt (*Zweiter und sechster Paian*, pp. 40/1) argues that this specialized sense, 'entering competition,' was not known to Pindar, on the basis of the fact that in ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] | γλῶσσα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν [καταχεῦαι] ἀγῶνα Λοξία καταβάντ' εὐρὺν ἐν θεῶν ξενίαι, *Pae.*6.58-61, Pindar does not refer to a (musical) contest: "Die Tatsache, daß Pindar dieses Auftreten mit ἀγῶνα καταβαίνειν bezeichnet, wobei ἀγών Versammlungs-, nicht Kampfplatz bedeutet, zeigt meiner Ansicht nach ganz deutlich, daß in καταβαίνειν für ihn noch nicht der Gedanke an Kampf lag." (p. 41). However, there are some objections to this line of reasoning. First, καταβάντ' has a direct object here, referring to the destination of the movement implied in the verb, as usual; this passage is of limited value for determining the connotations of absolute καταβαίνω. Second, the reference of ἀγῶνα Λοξία ... εὐρύν will have been perfectly clear to the audience, so as to exclude misunderstandings, regardless of the connotations of the verb. Third, it cannot be excluded that Pindar refers to his own role in terminology that evokes agonistic connotations; possibly the association occurred to him by the fact that the *Paean* was to be performed at the venue of the Pythian games.

There are, apart from *h.l.*, three examples of absolute καταβαίνω in Pindar.

In ἔμπα, καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιὰς ἅλμα | μέσσον, ἀντίτειν' ἐπιβουλίαις· σφόδρα δόξομεν | δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν· | φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων | γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότωι κυλίνδει | χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν, *N.*4.36-41, the verb could be taken literal: 'we will step down into the light' (with the focus on ἐν φάει; the verb is rather colourless with this literal interpretation). However, the wrestling imagery in lines 36/7 (ἔχει ... μέσσον, ἀντίτειν', ὑπέρτεροι)[116] and the reference to the 'enemies' (δαΐων) evoke the idea of competition, and this gives the verb far more poignancy. 'We will step down into the arena, in full light, by far superior, as will become apparent, to our adversaries.' ἐν φάει (38) goes well with this imagery, as the arena is

[115] Thus Radt, *Zweiter und sechster Paian*, p. 40.

[116] See Poliakoff, *Terminology of Greek Combat Sports*, pp. 40-53; Willcock *ad loc.*, p. 101. It is, of course, a typically Pindaric 'mixed metaphor', in that βαθεῖα ποντιὰς ἅλμα evokes the idea of swimming.

exposed to the blazing sun (cf. *N.*7.73), and so does the presentation of the envious attitude in terms of βλέπων (39). Radt (p. 40) is, of course, right in saying that, in the context of an athletic victory, the poet's role—as that of the envious ἄλλος ἀνηρ, for that matter—becomes relevant only after competition. But this is no reason to reject agonistic connotations to the verb here. The poet describes his role, preserving the victor's fame and glory notwithstanding the presence of forces that aim at damaging his good repute,[117] in imagery derived from athletic competition, in terms of a 'wrestling match' against the envious.

In cυγγενεῖ δέ τις εὐδοξίαι μέγα βρίθει. I ὃς δὲ δίδακτ' ἔχει, ψεφηνὸς ἀνὴρ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων οὔ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ I κατέβα ποδὶ, μυριᾶν δ' ἀτελεῖ νόωι γεύεται, *N.*3.40-2, there is a contrast between the man having cυγγενὴς εὐδοξία, which is a guarentee for success, and the man who merely has δίδακτα and that will not succeed. The contrast between failure and success is formulated in terms of οὔ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ κατέβα ποδί, elaborated upon by ἀτελεῖ, as opposed to μέγα βρίθει in line 40 (see my notes *ad loc.*, pp. 324-8). The qualification ἀτρεκεῖ ... ποδί guides the hearer to take κατέβα in the first place literal: 'does not ever step down with sure foot', i.e., 'never walks steadily'. However, agonistic connotations give the verb a far deeper significance. Thus, the relevance of the gnomic passage in 40-2 to the victor is stressed, because "the description of the failure in 41 ff. contains two expressions which suggest athletics, an indication that this man is meant to contrast the endurance of Aristoclides. καταβαίνω can mean 'enter the list'. ἀτρεκεῖ ποδί suggests the ability of the wrestler or pancratiast to trip his opponent without himself being tripped" (Carey, *Eranos* 78, 1980, 158).

The third and last case in point is: εἰ δέ τις ἀρκέων φίλοις I ἐχθροῖcι τραχὺς ὑπαντιάζει, I μόχθος ἡcυχίαν φέρει καιρῶι καταβαίνων, *Pae.*2.31-4. This the most difficult of the three, because καταβαίνων cannot possibly be taken literal. Radt gives: "'die Mühe die zur rechten Zeit eintrifft', eine treffende Bezeichnung für die einer weit entfernten Stadt wie Teos geleistete Hilfe" (*Zweiter und sechster Paian,*

---

[117] In ἐμοὶ δ' ὁποίαν ἀρετὰν I ἔδωκε πότμος ἄναξ, I εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι χρόνος ἕρπων πεπρωμέναν τελέcει, *N.*4.41-3, ἀρετάν does not refer to Pindar's 'poetic genius', but to the achievements of others (victors) given to him by Lord Destiny as subject matter. If commemorated in song by Pindar, such great deeds will live on (6-8) and have the 'destined' effect, i.e., the effect they deserve: fame and glory. Thus there is a strong contrast with the preceding lines about the φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων: give an achievement to one person and you will get envy, but if you give it to Pindar it will earn you fame and glory. καί in 44, then, does not 'simply specify or emphasise' (Willcock, *ad loc.*), but underscores the parallelism of the present ode as a whole with the general principle just laid out.

p. 42). This gives excellent sense. The problem, however, is that the meaning 'arrive, attain one's goal' is, *pace* Radt, not paralleled by the other Pindaric examples of absolute καταβαίνειν. An attempt to bring this passage in line with the other examples would result in: 'effort that enters the contest with καιρός'[118] (i.e., 'on the right moment' or 'seizing the opportunity'). The possibility of assistance in an armed conflict being here referred to in agonististic terminolgy is not to be excluded; this interpretation may gain some support from the wrestling terms in the scholiast's paraphrase of the following lines[119], of which only scanty fragments survive.

For all three examples of καταβαίνω used absolutely in Pindar, 'entering the list' is a possible interpretation. In *N.*3.40-2 and *N.*4.36-41, this interpretation is clearly correct, since it gives these passages a far deeper significance. *Pae.*2.31-4 is more difficult in this respect. No other unifying description of Pindar's usage of absolute καταβαίνω is quite as satisfactory. The evidence suggests that for Pindar, as for authors of later date, absolute καταβαίνω refers to 'entering the list.'

A **μέτρον**, 'a measure', is, in archaic Greek usage, the full (standard) amount (or length) of something. Measuring did not consist of expressing quantity (or length) in terms of a point on a scale, but rather in terms of a number of full standard measures.

> Cf. δῶκεν Ἰηcονίδηc ἀγέμεν μέθυ, χίλια μέτρα, *Il.*7.471; εἴκοcι δ' ἔcτω μέτρα ... ἀλφίτου, *Od.*2.355, etc. Cf. also πρὶν ὀδυνηρὰ γήραοc c[.....[120] μ]ολεῖν, | πρίν τιc εὐθυμίαι cκιαζέτω | νόημ' ἄκοτον ἐπὶ μέτρα, ἰδὼν | δύναμιν οἰκόθετον, *Pae.*1.1-4, 'When the pains of eld draw near, let a man clothe his ungrudging mind with gladness about the measures, seeing the resources stored in his home,'[121] i.e., 'seeing the measures of resources stored in his home.'

The noun does not so much evoke connotations of proportion in scalarity, but rather of quantity in relation with the full standard amount. Thus, especially in the singular, μέτρον is a 'terminative' concept, evoking connotations of a limit, a border line, the cup being filled to the brim: more is too much.

---

[118] Thus Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 187.

[119] Σ. on 43 ff. (Radt, p. 14*): τὸ νόημα τ[ο]ιοῦτο· ἐν οἷc γὰρ διαφέρειν δοκοῦcιν οἱ ἀντίπαλοι κατὰ πόλεμον, ταῦτα ἐκπονεῖν ἀγαθὰc ὑποτίθεται νίκηc ἐλπίδαc. ἢ ἡ ἵπποc εὐθετεῖ πρὸc τ(ὴν) τ(ῶν) ἀντιπάλων παντοδαπὴν ἔφοδον, οἷον ἐάν τε πεζεύωcιν ἐάν τε μεθ' ἵππων παρατυγχάνωcιν, τρεψόμεθα αὐτοὺc τῶι ἱππικῶι.

[120] c[χεδὸν μ] Grenfell-Hunt; c[ταθμὰ μ] Wilamowitz.

[121] Translation adapted from Sandys (p. 519). The Σ. paraphrases μετρίωc; this would be a very modest, and indeed depressing advise. Grenfell-Hunt say "i.e., the more a man has, the greater should be his thankfulness." The idea is much simpler. The plural μέτρα strongly argues in favour of taking it literal, in the sense of 'measures', i.e., 'quantity.'

Cf. ἄφρονος ἀνδρὸς ὁμῶς καὶ σώφρονος οἶνος ὅταν δὴ | πίνῃ ὑπὲρ μέτρον κοῦφον ἔθηκε νόον, Thgn.497/8 (cf. Pl.*R*.621a). In passages like ἔντοσθεν δέ τ' ἄνευ δεσμοῖο μένουσι | νῆες ἐύσσελμοι, ὅτ' ἂν ὅρμου μέτρον ἵκωνται, *Od*.13.101, 'when the reach the end of their voyage, which is the anchorage', the denotation 'full measure' is excluded in favour of the connotation 'limit, end-point'. In σπασσάμενος δ' ἄροτρον, βοέους δήσαις ἀνάγκαι | ἔντεσιν αὐχένας ἐμβάλλων τ' ἐριπλεύρωι φυᾶι | κέντρον αἰανὲς βιατὰς ἐξεπόνης' ἐπιτακτὸν ἀνὴρ | μέτρον, *P*.4.234-7 (*sc*. Jason, ploughing with the oxen of Aietes), the 'terminative' connotation of the notion μέτρον is very clear: Jason achieved the appointed distance *to the end*. Cf. also τὴν δεκάτην δ' εἴ τις τελέσας κατὰ μέτρον ἵκοιτο, | οὐκ ἂν ἄωρος ἐὼν μοῖραν ἔχοι θανάτου, Sol.27.17/8 W.

In οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει, *P*.4.286, μέτρον refers to a temporal 'measure': 'compass, space'. The emphasis is more on the seize of the measure than on the limit it implies. The καιρός 'goes in very small measures', so to speak. One quickly reaches the point that waiting longer means having waited for too long. Cf. also: πάντα δ' ἐξειπεῖν, ὅσ' ἀγώνιος Ἑρμᾶς | Ἡροδότωι ἔπορεν | ἵπποις, ἀφαιρεῖται βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων ὕμνος, *I*.1.60-3.

The phrase μέτρον ἥβης means 'the full measure of youth', implying that youthful vigour has come to full bloom. Cf. καί νύ κεν ἐξετέλεσσαν, εἰ ἥβης μέτρον ἵκοντο· | ἀλλ ὄλεσεν Διὸς υἱός ... | ... πρίν σφωϊν ὑπὸ κροτάφοισιν ἰούλους | ἀνθῆσαι πυκάσαι τε γένυς εὐανθέϊ λάχνῃ, *Od*.11.317-20; Κισσῆς τόν γ' ἔθρεψε δόμοις ἔνι τυτθὸν ἐόντα | μητροπάτωρ ....· | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἥβης ἐρικυδέος ἵκετο μέτρον, αὐτοῦ μιν κατέρυκε, δίδου δ' ὅ γε θυγατέρα ἥν, *Il*.11.223-6; ἀλλ' ἑκατὸν μὲν παῖς ἔτεα παρὰ μητέρι κεδνῇ | ἐτρέφετ' ἀτάλλων, μέγα νήπιος, ᾧι ἐνὶ οἴκωι. | ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἄρ' ἡβῆσαι τε καὶ ἥβης μέτρον ἵκοιτο, κτλ, Hes.*Op*.130-2; Thgn.438, 1119, etc.

Μέτρον, as a moral concept in Pindar, is traditionally rendered as 'due measure.'[122] 'Full measure' is more precise, to the extent that it brings to light the 'terminative' connotation more poignantly. The idea underlying the concept is not 'right proportion,' implying balance, but rather 'repleteness', implying a maximum[123]. If, e.g., someone is said to 'heed the μέτρον of his happiness', he is said to be aware of the 'full measure' of his happiness, to the extent that he is conscious of the fact that his happiness will not be unlimited. Μέτρον thus implies an (imaginary) boundary: 'more is too much.'

---

[122] Thus, e.g., Slater *s.v.* The noun μέτρον does not occur in the extant works of Bacchylides.

[123] Passages like Βάκχου μέτρον ἄριστον ὃ μὴ πολὺ μηδ' ἐλάχιστον, Euen.*fr*.2.1 W., seem at first sight to suggest the interpretation 'due measure' for μέτρον, implying a balance; however, here the 'best measure' for wine is defined, i.e., the most wholesome quantity. The explicit qualification ἄριστον makes clear that μέτρον in itself does not imply 'best measure.'

Cf. χρὴ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν αἰεὶ παντὸς ὁρᾶν μέτρον, *P.*2.34, 'one must, in accord with one's own status[124], always keep one's eyes fixed on the full measure of everything.' This comments upon the story of Ixion's big mistake: he had all he could wish for, enjoyed a sweet live among the gods (25/6), but was not content with that yet: he fancied Hera and acted accordingly. When applied to Ixion's story, μέτρον refers to the 'full measure' of Ixion's bliss: by wanting more he wanted too much; that was the line that was not to be crossed. He enjoyed extraordinary favours, but these were not unlimited: there was a μέτρον to them.

In ἕπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάστωι | μέτρον· νοῆσαι δὲ καιρὸς ἄριστος, *O.*13.47/8, the gnomes are part of a transitional passage. They are the motivation for a 'break off' of the common type 'too much to tell', following a lengthy victory catalogue. So here, too, μέτρον has reference to the 'full measure' of something positive. Here, too, it refers to the idea 'more is too much'. The following assertion, then, about καιρός being best to keep in mind, specifies that, in this context, the limit implied by μέτρον ties in with effectiveness in the present circumstance: 'now, more would be too much, for ineffective; going on telling about the victor's achievements would overshoot the mark.'

In κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν· | ἀπροσίκτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀξύτεραι μανίαι, *N.*11.47/8, κερδέων ... μέτρον refers to the 'full measure of material profits', i.e., their limit. Thus, in effect, the gnome is an injunction to show a restraint in the hunt for profits. μέτρον comes as a kind of ἀπροσδόκητον with θηρευέμεν. This mirrors the common attitude against which this gnome takes a stand: What people do, is hunting for profits, without restraint; but what they should do, is hunting for the awareness that there is a limit to trying to accumulate riches, i.e., hunting for a restraint in hunting for profits. The following sentence specifies that, in this context, the limit consists of what is within one's reach.

In Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν | ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾶι τοῦτ' ἔπος, | υἱοῖσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ, | ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἑῶι προσάγων | καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται, | μέτρα μὲν γνώμαι διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων, *I.*6.66-71, γνώμαι is an indication that the μέτρα are to be taken as a moral concept, along the lines of the passages just discussed: Lampon has an awareness of the 'full measures' of things; he heeds them in his ambitions (μέτρα μὲν γνώμαι διώκων, cf. *N.*11.47) and sticks to them (κατέχων), implying that he does not lose sight of them, and that he does not go any any further as soon as he has reached the 'full measure' of something. However, μέτρα may be ambiguous here. The plural, as well as the preceding hints at his wealth (ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἑῶι προσάγων, εὐεργεσίαις), suggests a literal interpretation of μέτρα (cf. *Pae.*1.1-4, *Il.*7.471, *Od.*2.355, quoted above). Lampon is an Aeginetan aristocrat, probably a 'ship

---

[124] When applied to Ixion's story, κατ' αὐτόν, 'in accord with oneself, with what one is', specifies that Ixion's crime consisted of wanting more than his status allowed for.

owner', whose power and property is based on trade and piracy. He will indeed have been occupying himself with 'measures' of commodities, pursuing them and trying to keep them, or their equivalent in profit. This double relevance gives μέτρα much poignancy. Thus, Pindar economically says, in one and the same expression, that Lampon pursues riches and knows how to hang on to them, and that he knows about the limits, when more is too much (along the lines of *N.*11.47), which explains exactly why he successfully manages to maintain his riches.[125]

• *Text; Assessment:* As argued above, there are three readings worth considering: (1) μέτρωι κατάβαιν'· ἐν ...; (2) μέτρωι καταβαίνειν· {ἐν}; (3) μέτρωι καταβαίνει. {ἐν}.

(1) For μέτρωι κατάβαιν', as an imperative directed to the victor, two different interpretations have been proposed: (i) μέτρωι κατάβαιν' is generally taken to mean 'compete in measure, be moderate in your entering for contests' (Bowra, Farnell). Although this interpretation has the advantage of a smooth and easy link with the following context,[126] there is a major objection to it. An advise to the victor to have a restraint in entering further contests is for Pindar unparalleled and foreign to the epinician ethos. "Everywhere Pindar urges the athlete to exert πόνος, to seize the moments of success; moderation is for one's *attitude*, not for competitive effort" (Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 121; cf. Crotty, *Song and Action*, p. 141; Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 480/1 n. 52). In this specific ode such an advise would be especially inopportune, since Aristomenes is still a boy, and since his palmares is modest so far, lacking above all the greatest of all prizes, an Olympic victory. In such a situation an injunction to the young victor not to take part in too many contests could easily be misunderstood as a career advise to look out for a different occupation[127]. Gildersleeve *ad loc.* (p. 332) renders 'seek no further contests', specifying "thou hast victories enough *of this kind*. ... Aristomenes was leaving the ranks of the παῖδες παλαισταί" (my italics). This is less problematic with respect to the general epinician ethos; but the interpretation depends exactly on the addition 'of this kind' of which there is nothing in the Greek. (ii) Miller, *GRBS* 30, 1989, 480-3, interprets μέτρωι κατάβαιν' as 'keep on entering contests in accordance with the principle of due measure' (p. 481), as an injunction to the victor to *continue* to pursue his athletic career "with the same

---

[125] On μέτρον see further R.A. Prier, *CW* 70, 1976, 161-9.

[126] Thus Farnell *ad loc.*, II p. 199.

[127] Farnell (*ad loc.*, p. 199) ascribes the oddity of the advice to Pindar's old age: "Strange advice for Pindar to give to the young, and somewhat prosaic! But towards the end of his life Pindar may have observed that athletics could be overdone and that it was not desirable to be a 'pot hunter'."

cautious moderation of outlook that has characterized it thus far, never losing sight of the innate limitations under which his species labors" (pp. 482/3). As opposed to (i), this advice is perfectly well in keeping with the general epinician ethos. However, the main problem with this interpretation resides in the semantics of μέτρωι. As μέτρον (especially in the singular and when used in a metaphorical sense, as here), is a 'terminative' notion, evoking connotations of 'repleteness', implying a limit, it is highly improbable that μέτρωι κατάβαιν' would have been understood otherwise than an admonition to the victor to put a restraint on his athletic ambitions. Transferring the relevance of the limit implied by μέτρωι from the action referred to by the verb it qualifies to the general mental attitude of the subject of the verb, is going one step further than the Greek allows for.

(2) It will be clear that the same two possibilities exist for καταβαίνειν if taken as an *infinitivus pro imperativo*,[128] with the same objections. καταβαίνειν could also depend on παρίcχει (cf. S.*Tr.*1114, Th.1.37)[129]: 'the δαίμων provides (i.e., grants, allows), while tossing up high in the air, now one, now another, and casting another beneath his hands, to enter competition with measure.' This interpretation founders on the same grounds as (1), since it implies that, due to the δαίμων, one has or should have a restraint in entering further contests. Moreover, δαίμων δὲ παρίcχει ... μέτρωι καταβαίνειν does not really work as the counterpart of τὰ δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνδράcι κεῖται (76). Finally, the placement of the two-fold participle clause in between the finite verb and the infinitive it governs, is awkward.

(3) For μέτρωι καταβαίνει, with the δαίμων as subject, three different interpretations have been proposed: (i) Taking καταβαίνει as transitive and causal, with ἄλλον as its object: 'bring down, reduces to moderation', cf. ἀντὶ τοῦ καταβαίνειν ποιεῖ, Σ. *ad loc.* (111a, II 217 Dr.).[130] This gives an unparalleled and highly improbable meaning of the verb. (ii) Taking καταβαίνει intransitive, in the sense of 'enter-

---

[128] For the *infinitivus pro imperativo* in Pindar cf. *fr.*106.7, *fr.*180.1, *N.*11.10, *I.*4.13; perhaps also *P.*1.68. See further Hummel, *Syntaxe*, pp. 280/1 (§ 353).

[129] βουλαὶ δὲ πρεcβύτεραι | ἀκίνδυνον ἐμοὶ ἔποc ⟨cὲ⟩ ποτὶ πάντα λόγον | ἐπαινεῖν παρέχοντι, *P.*2.65-7, is not to be compared, because the verb has an object: παρέχω/παρίcχω with an object and infinitive means 'presenting, offering' for a purpose, as in τουτὶ τοὐμον cῶμ' αὐτοῖcιν | παρέχω τύπτειν, Ar.*Nub.*440/1.

[130] Thus Slater *s.v.*; Boeckh, II 2, p. 317; Fennell *ad loc.*, p. 243; Fraccaroli, p. 139, n. 2; Schroeder *ad loc.*, p. 74; Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 442. Sandys connects μέτρωι with ὑπό: 'bringeth one below the level of his hands' (cf. Madvig, *Adversaria*, i.188: 'infra mensuram manuum'). In addition to the problem concerning the verb, this interpretation stretches the meaning of μέτρον beyond acceptance (cf. Farnell, *ad loc.*, II, p. 198).

ing the list'. The δαίμων is metaphorically described as a wrestler.[131] To this interpretation Miller (*GRBS* 30, 1989, 481 n. 52) objects that it results in the anomalous image of three simultaneous combatants.[132] Similar considerations led Burton to regard the δαίμων as "a kind of ghostly ἔφεδροϲ."[133] (iii) Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 232-7, in an attempt to avoid the anomality of a wrestling match between three opponents, suggested that the δαίμων is metaphorically described as an umpire (βραβεύϲ, βραβευτήϲ) who descends into the arena along with the two contestants and adjucidates victory and defeat while wielding his ῥάβδοϲ,[134] μέτρον standing for that. To this interpretation Miller rightly objects that "this conception is difficult to reconcile with the highly active rôle attibuted to the *daimon* in line 77" (*GRBS* 30, 1989, 481 n. 52). The context lacks signals that guide the hearer in thinking of an umpire instead of a wrestler. καταβαίνειν in the sense of 'entering the list' is used of the athlete, who descends into the arena in order to take part actively in the contest; this does not help to evoke associations with an umpire. Moreover, μέτρον for ῥάβδοϲ is by no means a self-evident metaphor; if at all, this metaphor would work only if the idea of an umpire had already been firmly established in audience's minds.

• *Conclusion:* The portrayal of the δαίμων as a wrestler in 77 strongly pleads in favour of taking him to be the subject of the verb, so: μέτρωι καταβαίνει, i.e. (3). The verb, then, is intransitive, in the sense of 'entering the list,' continuing the image of line 77, so interpretation (ii). This does not result in the anomaly of a wrestling match between three opponents. Line 77 does not evoke the picture of a wrestling match between *two* combatants, one winner and one loser, referred to by ἄλλον ... ἄλλον δ', the δαίμων steering the match between the two as an outsider ('putting at different times one man on top and another beneath the hands [*sc.* of his opponent]', Miller,

---

[131] Thus Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 189; Lefkowitz, *CJ* 72, 1977, 215; Kirkwood *ad loc.*, p. 213.

[132] Cf. Taillardat, *REG* 99, 1986, 232-4.

[133] "The scene envisaged by Pindar we may then suppose to be this: δαίμων stands by the arena in which two wrestlers are engaged, enters the fray in accordance with due measure and allots victory and defeat now to one, now to another. The intervention of gods in mortal contests in order to tip the balance is a familiar enough feature of epic poetry, and Pindar here develops that convention, using it for the activities of an impersonal δαίμων, a kind of ghostly ἔφεδροϲ, whose intervention he qualifies by the important word μέτρωι, thereby saving it from the charge of sheer caprice." Burton, *Pythian Odes*, p. 188.

[134] Taillardat (*REG* 99, 1986, 234/5) gives the following parallels for the idea: εἰϲ ὅ κε δαίμων | ἄμμε διακρίνηι, δώηι δ' ἑτέροιϲί γε νίκην, *Il.*7.291; μόνα δ' εὔλεκτροϲ ἐν μέϲωι Κύπριϲ | ῥαβδονομεῖ ξυνοῦϲα, S.*Tr.*515/6; Plb.1.58.1.

GRBS 30, 1989, 466). In fact, ἄλλοτ' excludes this interpretation. ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον means 'now one, now another,' viz. those favoured by the δαίμων; ἄλλον δ' then adds 'yet another', viz. someone who is disfavoured by the δαίμων. Thus, line 77 describes a series of wrestling matches between the δαίμων and an unspecified number of successive human opponents. In other words, the χεῖρες are his.[135] See my note on the preceding line (pp. 572-6).

The syntactic structure of 76-8 is mirrored by the following punctuation: τὰ δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κεῖται· δαίμων δὲ παρίσχει, | ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὕπερθε βάλλων· ἄλλον δ' ὑπὸ χειρῶν, | μέτρωι καταβαίνει. Μεγάροις δ' κτλ. The particle δ' in 77 coordinates the two sentences. This structure reflects the contrast between positive and negative intervention of the δαίμων: it is he who provides ἐσλά, favouring now one, now another; likewise, it is he who enters the arena in order to draw the line, disfavouring another.

It is not easy to pin down μέτρωι exactly. It is clear, however, that its connotations of a limit are relevant here, to the extent the δαίμων, by 'casting down' men, terminates his favouring them. The δαίμων's disfavouring humans is presented as a limit to their being favoured by him. His favours are not unlimited; there is a μέτρον to them, a moment when more is too much. Thus, the exact force resides in the δαίμων's drawing the line for one, after he has aided him for a while. 'This the deity provides, tossing on high now one, now another; by casting another below his hands, he enters the arena in keeping with the idea of full measure', i.e., by disfavouring someone, he demonstrates that there is a limit to his favours.

[135] Miller's "beneath the hands [*sc.* of his opponent]", has the disadvantage of assuming a different owner of the hands than the subject of the sentence. If that were meant, one would wish an additional signal for that.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

πολλὰ γὰρ πολλᾶι λέλεκται,
*N.*8.20.

For the complete Pindar bibliography from 1513 to 1987 see: P.A. Bernardini. 'Rassegna critica delle edizioni, traduzioni e studi pindarici dal 1958 al 1964 (1965)', *QUCC* 2, 1966, 136-193; D.E. Gerber, *A Bibliography of Pindar: 1513-1966*, Princeton 1969; M. Rico, *Ensayo de bibliografia pindarica*, Madrid 1969; S. Fogelmark, 'Pindaric Bibliography', *Eranos* 74, 1976, 69-102; E. Thummer, 'Pindaros', *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 11, 1958, coll. 65-88; *ibid.* 19, 1966, coll. 289-322; *ibid.* 27, 1974, coll. 1-34; *ibid.* 35, 1982, coll. 129-64; D.E. Gerber, 'Studies in Greek Lyric Poetry: 1967-1975', *CW* 70, 1976, 132-57; 'Studies in Greek Lyric Poetry: 1975-1985', *CW* 81, 1988, 439-479; 'Pindar and Bacchylides 1934-1987', *Lustrum* 31, 1989, 97-269; *ibid.* 32, 1990, 7-292.

The present select bibliography contains studies bearing directly upon the three odes commented upon in this book, as well as more general studies which I found helpful in understanding certain features of these odes. I have been selective with latter category; omissions in the former should not have occurred. Standard works of reference (LSJ, K.-G., Pauly-Wissowa, etc.) are omitted, as are standard editions of and commentaries on authors other than Pindar and Bacchylides.

ABEL, D.H., 'Genealogies of Ethical Concepts from Hesiod to Bacchylides', *TAPhA* 74, 1943, 92-101.

ADKINS, A.W.H., *Merit and Responsibility, A Study in Greek Values*, Chicago & London 1975² (Oxford 1960).

ADKINS, A.W.H., 'Threatening, Abusing and Feeling Angry in the Homeric Poems', *JHS* 89, 1969, 7-21.

ADKINS, A.W.H., *From the Many to the One, A Study of Personality and Views of Human Nature in the Context of Ancient Greek Society, Values and Beliefs*, London 1970.

ADKINS, A.W.H., *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece, From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century*, New York 1972.

AHLERT, P., *Mädchen und Frauen in Pindars Dichtung*, Diss. Berlin, Leipzig 1939.

AHRENS, E., *Gnomen in griechischer Dichtung (Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus)*, Halle 1937.

AHRENS, H.L., 'De dialecto dorica', Gottingae 1843.

ALESSIO, G.B. D', see: D'ALESSIO, G.B.

AMIT, M., *Great and Small Poleis. A Study in the Relations between the Great Powers and the Small Cities in Ancient Greece (Collection Latomus* 134), Bruxelles 1973.

ANASTASE, S., see: STÉFOS, A.

ANDREWES, A., 'Athens and Aegina, 510-480 B.C.', *ABSA* 37, 1936/7, 1-7.
ANGELI BERNARDINI, P., see: BERNARDINI, P.A.
ANZAI, M., 'First-Person Forms in Pindar: A Re-examination', *BICS* 39, 1994, 141-150.
ARDIZZONI, A., 'Note sul testo di Pindaro, *GIF* n.s. 5 (26), 1976, 255-259.
ARRIGHETTI, G., 'In tema di poetica greca arcaica e tardo-arcaica', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 25, 1976, 253-314.
ARRIGHETTI, G., *Poeti, eruditi e biografi*, Pisa 1987.
ASMUTH, B., *Aspekte der Lyrik. Mit einer Einführung in die Verslehre* (*Grundstudium Literaturwissenschaft* Bd.6), Leverkusen 1981[6].
AUGER, D., 'De l'artisan à l'athlète: les métaphores de la création poétique dans l'épinicie et chez Pindare', *Études de littérature ancienne* 3, Paris 1987, 35-56.
AUSTIN, T.R., *Poetic Voices. Discourse Linguistics and the Poetic Text*, Tuscaloosa & London 1994.

BAKKER, E.J., 'Homeric Discourse and Enjambement: A Cognitive Approach', *TAPhA* 120, 1990, 1-21.
BAKKER, E.J., 'Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization and "Presence" in Homeric Poetry', *CA* 12, 1993, 1-29.
BAKKER, E.J., 'Boundaries, Topics, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle *Dé*', *Studies in Language* 17, 1993, 275-311.
BARIGAZZI, A., 'L' unità dell' epinicio pindarico', *Atene e Roma* N.S. 4/5, 1952/3, 121-136.
BARKHUIZEN, J.H., *Etimologisering by Pindaros*, Diss. Pretoria 1975.
BARRETT, W.S., *Euripides. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964.
BARRETT, W.S., 'Pindar's Twelfth *Olympian* and the Fall of the Deinomenidai', *JHS* 93, 1973, 23-35.
BARRETT, W.S., 'The Oligaithiai and Their Victories (Pindar *Olympian* 13; *SLG* 339, 340)', *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry* (edd. R.D.Dawe, J.Diggle, P.E.Easterling), Cambridge 1978, 1-20.
BEARDSLEE, J.W., *The Use of* Φῦcιc *in Fifth-Century Greek Literature*, Chicago 1918.
BECKER, O., *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (*Hermes*, Einzelschriften, Heft 4), Berlin 1937.
BEHAGEL, O., 'Beziehungen zwischen Umfang und Reihenfolge von Satzgliedern', *Indogerm. Forsch.* 25, 1909, 110-142.
BELL, J.M., 'God, Man, and Animal in Pindar's Second Pythian', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury* (ed. D.E.Gerber), Chico 1984, 3-31.
BELTON, J., *Olympian 10, Olympian 13, Pythian 9 and the Occasional Nature of the Pindaric Epinician*, Diss. Harvard University, Cambridge (Mass.) 1975.
BENEDICTUS, J., *Πινδάρου Περίοδος. Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia*, Salmurii (Saumur) 1620.
BENGTSON, H., *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit*, München 1960[2].

Bergk, T., *Pindari Carmina*, Lipsiae 1878[4].

Bernard, M., *Pindars Denken in Bildern: Vom Wesen der Metapher*, Pfullingen 1963.

Bernardini, P.A., 'Linguaggio e programma poetico in Pindaro', *QUCC* 4, 1967, 80-97.

Bernardini, P.A., ' L' "aquila tebana" vola ancora', *QUCC* 26, 1977, 121-6.

Bernardini, P.A., 'Esaltazione e critica dll' atletismo nella poesia greca dal VII al V sec. a.C.: storia di un' ideologia', *Stadion* 6, 1980, 81-111.

Bernardini, P.A., *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro. La Nemea 4, l'Olimpica 9, l'Olimpica 7*, Roma 1983.

Bernardini, P.A., 'L'attualità agonistica negli epinici di Pindaro', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 117-153.

Bernardini, P.A. (ed), *Lo sport in Grecia*, Roma & Bari 1988.

Bernardini, P.A., 'La storia dell'epinicio: aspetti socio-economici', *SIFC* 10, 1992, 965-979.

Bernardini, P.A.: See also Gentili *et al.*

Bers, V., *Enallage and Greek Style* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 29), Leiden 1974.

Bers, V., *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*, New Haven & London 1984.

Bieler, L., 'Cκιᾶc ὄναρ ἄνθρωποc', *WS* 51, 1933, 143-145 (= *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, edd. W.M. Calder III & J. Stern, Darmstadt 1970, 191-3).

Bippart, G., *Pindars Leben, Weltanschauung und Kunst*, Jena 1848.

Bischoff, H., *Gnomen Pindars*, Würzberg 1938.

Bissinger, M., *Das Adjektiv μέγαc in der griechischen Dichtung* (*Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, Beiheft K), 2 vols., München 1966.

Blech, M., *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin & New York 1982.

Blundell, M.W., *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*, Cambridge 1989.

Boeckh, A., *Über die Versmasse des Pindaros*, Berlin 1809.

Boeckh, A., *Pindari Opera quae supersunt*, Lipsiae 1811-21.

Bona, G., *Pindaro, I Peani. Testo, traduzione, scoli e commento*, Cuneo 1988.

Bonelli, G., *Il mondo poetico di Pindaro*, Turino 1987.

Bonelli, G., 'Pindaro. Formalismo e critica estetica', *AC* 56, 1987, 26-55.

Bornemann, L., 'Pindar's achte pythische Ode nebst einem Anhang über die Pythiadenrechnung', *Philologus* 50, 1891, 230-247.

Borthwick, E., 'Zoologica Pindarica', *CQ* n.s. 26, 1976, 198-205.

Bossler, C., *De praepositionum usu apud Pindarum*, Diss. Gießen, Darmstadt 1862.

Boulay, J. du, *Portrait of a Greek Mountain Village*, Oxford 1974.

Bowie, E.L., 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposion and Public Festival', *JHS* 106, 1986, 13-39.

Bowra, C.M., 'Metrical Correspondance at Pindar', *CQ* 1933, 81ff.

Bowra, C.M., *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford 1935.

Bowra, C.M., 'Pindar, Pythian II', *HSCPh* 48, 1937, 1-28.

Bowra, C.M., *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 1961[2].

Bowra, C.M., *Pindar*, Oxford 1964.

Bowra, C.M., *The Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore 1969 (translation).

Braswell, B.K., 'Ζαμενής, a Lexicographical Note on Pindar', *Glotta* 57, 1979, 182-190.

Braswell, B.K., '*Color Epicus* in Pindar: A Falsely Assumed Type', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury* (ed. D.E.Gerber), Chico 1984, 33-36.

Braswell, B.K., *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, Berlin & New York 1988.

Braswell, B.K., *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One*, Fribourg 1992.

Brelich, A., *Gli eroi greci. Un problema storico-religioso*, Roma 1958.

Bremer, D., *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Bonn 1976.

Bremer, J.M., 'Pindar's Paradoxical ἐγώ and a Recent Controversy about the Performance of his Epinicia', in: *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric, Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (ed. S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1990, 41-58.

Bremer, J.M., 'Poets and their Patrons', *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (ed. H. Hofmann), Göttingen 1991, 39-60.

Bresson, A., *Mythe et contradiction. Analyse de la VIIe Olympique de Pindare*, Paris 1979.

Briggs Jr., W.W., 'B.L. Gildersleeve on Pindar *Nemean* 3.74-75', *GRBS* 25, 1984, 233-242.

Brillante, C., 'Crescita e apprendimento: l'educazione del giovane eroe', *QUCC* n.s. 37, 1991, 7-28.

Brillante, C., 'Amore senza χάρις: Pind. *Pyth.* II 42-48', *QUCC* 49, 1995, 33-38.

Brodersen, K., 'Zur Datierung der ersten Pythien', *ZPE* 82, 1990, 25-31.

Brown, N.O., 'Pindar, Sophocles, and the Thirty Years' Peace', *TAPhA* 82, 1951, 1-6.

Buchholz, E., *Die sittliche Weltanschauung des Pindaros und Aeschylos*, Leipzig 1869 (repr. Aalen 1985).

Buijs, M., 'Aspectual Differences and Narrative Technique. The Case of Xenophon's *Agesilaus* & *Hellenica*', (forthcoming).

Bulman, P., *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley (Cal.) 1992.

Bultmann, R., 'Zur Geschichte der Lichtsymbolik im Altertum', *Philologus* 97, 1948, 1-36.

Bundy, E.L., *Hesychia in Pindar*, Diss. Berkeley 1954.

Bundy, E.L., *Studia Pindarica I, II*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1962 (*University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 18, 1962, 1-34, 35-92).

Bundy, E.L., 'Pindar's Lives', *Classica et Iberica: A Festschrift in Honor of the Revered Joseph M.-F. Marique, S.J.* (ed. P.T. Brannan, S.J.), Worcester Mass. 1975, 69-72.

Burkert, W., *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley 1979.

Burkert, W., 'ΘΕΩΝ ΟΠΙΝ ΟΥΚ ΑΛΕΓΟΝΤΕϹ. Götterfurcht und Leumannsches Mißverständnis', *MH* 38, 1981, 195-204.

Burnett, A.P., *The Art of Bacchylides*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1985.
Burnett, A.P., 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CPh* 84, 1989, 283-293.
Burton, R.W.B., *Pindar's Pythian Odes, Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford 1962.
Bury, J.B., *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, London 1890.
Bury, J.B., *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*, London 1892.
Bury, J.B., Cook S.A., Adcock F.E., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, V, Cambridge 1935².

Cairns, D.L., *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford 1993.
Cairns, D.L., 'Off with her αἰδώς: Herodotus 1.8.3-4', *CQ* 46, 1996, 78-83.
Cairns, D.L., '*Hybris*, Dishonour, and Thinking Big', *JHS* 116, 1996, 1-32.
Cairns, D.L., 'Veiling, αἰδώς, and a Red-Figure Amphora by Phintias', *JHS* 116, 1996, 152-158.
Cairns, D.L., 'Form and Meaning in Bacchylides' Fifth Ode', *Scholia* n.s. 6, 1997, 34-48.
Cairns, F., '"Ερως in Pindar's First Olympian Ode', *Hermes* 105, 1977, 129-132.
Calabrese de Feo, M.R., 'Gli Iperborei in Pindaro', *Poesie et lyrique antiques. Actes du colloque organisé par Claude Meillier à l'université Charles-de-Gaulle — Lille III du 2 au 4 juin 1993* (ed. L. Dubois), Lille 1995, 97-118.
Calvani Mariotti, G., 'Ricerche sulla tecnica esegetica degli scholia vetera a Pindaro', *Ricerche di Filologia classica* 3, Pisa 1987, 83-167.
Calvani Mariotti, G., & Derenzini, G., 'Commenti agli *Epinici* di Pindaro', *SCO* 26, 1977, 157-186.
Campanger, R., 'Reciprocità economica in Pindaro', *QUCC* 28, 1988, 77-93.
Campbell, D.A., *The Golden Lyre: The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets*, London 1983.
Cannatà Fera, M., *Pindarus, Threnorum fragmenta*, Rome 1990.
Carey, C., 'Pindar's Eighth Nemean Ode', *PCPhS* 22, 1976, 26-42.
Carey, C., 'Pindarica', *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry* (edd. R.D. Dawe, J. Diggle, P.E. Easterling), Cambridge 1978, 21-44.
Carey, C., 'Three Myths in Pindar: *N*.4, *O*.9, *N*.3', *Eranos* 78, 1980, 143-162.
Carey, C., 'Bacchylides' Experiments: Ode 11', *Mnemosyne* 33, 1980, 225-243.
Carey, C., 'The Epilogue of Pindar's Fourth Pythian', *Maia* 32, 1980, 143-144.
Carey, C., *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*, Salem 1981.
Carey, C., 'Prosopographica Pindarica', *CQ* 39, 1989, 1-9.
Carey, C., 'Two Transitions in Pindar, *O*.8.52-5, *N*.5.37-42', *CQ* 39, 1989, 287-295.
Carey, C., 'The Performance of the Victory Ode', *AJPh* 110, 1989, 545-565.
Carey, C., 'The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus', *CPh* 86, 1991, 192-200.

Carey, C., 'Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode', *Tria Lustra. Essays and notes presented to John Pinsent, founder and editor of Liverpool Classical Monthly by some of its contributors on the occasion of the 150th issue* (ed. H.D. Jocelyn with the assistance of Helena Hurt) (*Liverpool Classical Papers* 3), Liverpool 1993, 97-107.

Carey, C., 'Pindar and the Victory Ode', *The Passionate Intellect. Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions Presented to Professor I.G. Kidd* (ed. L. Ayres) (*Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities* 7), New Brunswick & London 1995, 85-103.

Carey, C., 'Ethos and Pathos in Bacchylides', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999, 17-29.

Carne-Ross, D.S., *Pindar*, New Haven & London 1985.

Carnes, J.S., *Pindar's Use of Aiginetan Autochthony Myths*, Diss. Chapel Hill (North Carolina) 1986; summary in *DA* 47, 1987, 3418A.

Carnes, J.S., 'The Aeginetan Genesis of the Myrmidons: A Note on *Nemean* 3.13-16', *CW* 84, 1990, 41-44.

Carnes, J.S., 'Aiakos, Flower of Justice: A Reading of *Nemean* 3.29', *Hermes* 122, 1994, 360-363.

Carnes, J.S., *The Uses of Aiakos. Myth and Politics in Pindar's Aeginetan Odes*, Savage (MD) (forthcoming).

Carrière, J., 'Sur l'Olympique II de Pindare, A propos d'un récent examen', *REG* 86, 1973, 436-443.

Casson, L., *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*, Princeton (New Jersey) 1971.

Casswell, C.P., *A Study of Thumos in Early Greek Epic* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 114), Leiden 1990.

Catenacci, C., 'Il tiranno alle Colonne d'Eracle. L'agonistica e le tirannidi arcaiche', *Nikephoros* 5, 1992, 11-36.

Cerrato, L., *La tecnica composizione delle odi pindariche*, Genoa 1888.

Cerri, G., 'A proposito del futuro e della litote in Pindaro: *Nem.*7.102 sgg.', *QUCC* 22, 1976, 83-90.

Christ, W., *Die metrische Überlieferung der pindarischen Oden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Metrik*, München 1868.

Christ, W., *Pindari carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa*, Lipsiae 1896.

Chuvin, P., 'Un éloge paradoxal de l'aulos dans la douzième Pythique à Midas d'Agrigente, Aulète, 490 av. J.-C.', *Poesie et lyrique antiques. Actes du colloque organisé par Claude Meillier à l'université Charles-de-Gaulle — Lille III du 2 au 4 juin 1993* (ed. L. Dubois), Lille 1995, 119-127.

Cingano, E., 'Problemi di critica pindarica', *QUCC* n.s. 2, 1979, 169-182.

Cingano, E., 'Interpretazioni pindariche', *QUCC* 36, 1990, 143-162.

Cingano, E.: See also Gentili *et al.*

Colace, P.R., 'Considerazioni sul concetto di "πλοῦτος" in Pindaro', *Studi in Onore di Anthos Ardizzoni* (E. Livrea & G.A. Privitera, edd.), Roma 1978, 735-745.

Cole, T., *Epiploke. Rhythmical Continuity and Poetic Structure in Greek Lyric*, Cambridge (Ma.) 1988.

COLE, T., '1+1=3: Studies in Pindar's Arithmetic', *AJPh* 110, 1989, 545-565.

COLE, T., *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power*, Roma 1992.

CONWAY, G.S., *The Odes of Pindar*, London 1972.

CONWAY, G.S., & STONEMAN, R., *Pindar. The Odes and Selected Fragments*, London 1997.

COPPOLA, G., *Introduzione a Pindaro*, Rome 1931.

CROISET, A., *La poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec*, Paris 1880.

CROTTY, K., *Pindaric Beginnings: The Uses of Structure in Pindar*, Diss. Yale University, New Haven 1975.

CROTTY, K., 'Pythian 2 and Conventional Language in the Epinicians', *Hermes* 108, 1980, 1-12.

CROTTY, K., *Song and Action; The Victory Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore & London 1982.

CROWTHER, N.B., 'Studies in Greek Athletics', *CW* 78, 1985, 497-558 and *CW* 79, 1986, 73-135.

DALE, A.M., *Collected Papers*, Cambridge 1969.

D'ALESSIO, G.B., 'First-Person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39, 1994, 117-139.

DARCUS SULLIVAN, S., 'A Study of φρένες in Pindar and Bacchylides', *Glotta* 67, 1989, 148-189.

DARCUS SULLIVAN, S., 'An Analysis of the Psychic Term νόος in Pindar and Bacchylides', *Glotta* 68, 1990, 179-202.

DARCUS SULLIVAN, S., 'The Wider Meaning of *Psyche* in Pindar and Bacchylides', *SIFC* 84, 1991, 163-183.

DARCUS SULLIVAN, S., *Psychological and Ethical Ideas. What Early Greeks Say* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 114), Leiden 1995.

DAVIES, M., 'Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Handbook', *CQ* 38, 1988, 52-64.

DAVISON, J.A., *From Archilochus to Pindar*, London 1968.

DEFRADAS, J., 'Sur l'interprétation de la deuxième Olympique de Pindare', *REG* 84, 1971, 131-143.

DEICHGRÄBER, K., *Charis und Chariten — Grazie und Graziens*, München 1971.

DEMAND, N., 'Pindar's Olympian 2, Theron's Faith, and Empedocles' Katharmoi', *GRBS* 16, 1975, 347-357.

DEMARQUE, M.C., *Traditional and Individual Ideas in Bacchylides*, Diss. University of Illinois, Urbana 1966.

DEMONT, P., *La cité grecque archaïque et classique et l'idéal de tranquillité*, Paris 1990.

DE PAUW, J.C., see: PAUW, J.C. DE.

DETTORI, E., 'Retractando atque expoliendo. Un nuovo commento ai Θρῆνοι di Pindaro', *GIF* 47, 1995, 293-298.

DES PLACES, É., *Le pronom chez Pindare. Recherches philologiques et critiques*, Paris 1947.

DES PLACES, É., 'Constructions grecques de mots à fonction double (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ)', *REG* 75, 1962, 1-12.

DEUBNER, L., 'Die viersaitige Leier', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*, 54, 1929, 194-200.
DEVEREUX, G., 'The Exploitation of Ambiguity in Pindaros *O*.3.27', *RhM* 109, 1966, 289-298.
DICKIE, M.W., 'On the Meaning of ἐφήμερος', *ICS* 1, 1976, 7-14.
DICKIE, M.W., 'Hêsychia and hybris in Pindar', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury* (ed. D.E. Gerber), Chico 1984, 83-109.
DICKIE, M.W., 'Fair and Foul Play in the Funeral Games in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Sport History* 11.2, 1984, 8-17.
DICKSON, K.M., 'Damasiphrōn Khrusos: Act, Implement and Tekhnē in Pindar', *Ramus* 15, 1986, 122-142.
DICKSON, K.M., 'The Semiotics of Eidos in *Olympian* 8', *Helios* 15, 1988, 115-126.
DICKSON, K.M., 'Voice and Sign in Pindar', *Ramus* 19, 1990, 109-129.
DIETEL, K., *Das Gleichnis in der frühen griechischen Lyrik*, Diss. München, Würzburg 1939.
DIK, H.J.M., *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 5), Diss. Amsterdam 1995.
DIK, S.C., *Coordination*, Amsterdam 1968.
DISEP, H., *Formen bildlichen Ausdrucks bei älteren griechischen Dichtern*, Diss. Göttingen 1951.
DISSEN, L., *Pindari carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis ex recensione Boeckhii commentario perpetuo illustravit*, Gotha & Erfurt 1830.
DODDS, E.R., *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1951.
DODDS, E.R., *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford 1960[2].
DOLIN, E.G., *Interpretations of Pindar's Isthmian 6 and Pythian 12*, Diss. Harvard University, Cambridge (Mass.) 1965.
DONALDSON, J.W., *Pindar's Epinician or Triumphal Odes*, London 1841, 1868[2].
DONLAN, W., 'The Tradition of Anti-Aristocratic Thought in Early Greek Poetry', *Historia* 22, 1973, 145-154.
DONLAN, W., *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece. Attitudes of Superiority from Homer to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Lawrence (Kansas) 1980.
DÖNT, E., *Pindar, Oden, griechisch / deutsch*, Stuttgard 1986.
DÖNT, M., 'Zur 14. olympischen Ode Pindars', *RhM* 126, 1983, 126-135.
DORNSEIFF, F., *Pindars Stil*, Berlin 1921.
DORNSEIFF, F., *Pindar übersetzt und erläutert*, Leipzig 1921.
DORNSEIFF, F., *Die archaische Mythenerzählung*, Berlin 1933.
DORNSEIFF, F., *Pindars olympische Hymnen*, Leipzig 1938.
DOUGHERTY, C., 'Pindar's Second Paean: Civic Identity on Parade', *CPh* 89, 1994, 205-218.
DOUGLAS OLSON, S., *Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 148), Leiden 1995.
DOYLE, R.E., '"Ολβος, Κόρος, "Υβρις and "Ατη from Hesiod to Aeschylus', *Traditio* 26, 1970, 293-303.
DRACHMANN, A.B., *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*, København 1891.

DRACHMANN, A.B., 'De duobus Pindari locis', *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi* 3.1, 1892/3, 162.
DRACHMANN, A.B., *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, Leipzig 1910.
DUCHEMIN, J., 'Essai sur le symbolisme Pindarique: or, lumière et couleurs', *REG* 65, 1952, 46-58.
DUCHEMIN, J., *Pindare, poète et prophète*, Paris 1955.
DUCHEMIN, J., 'Il simbolo dell' acquila nella poesia pindarica', *Conoscenza religiosa* 6, 1972, 402-413.

EBERT, J., *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen (Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.hist. Klasse* 63.2), Berlin 1972.
ECKER, U., *Grabmal und Epigramm: Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* (*Palingenesia* 29), Stuttgart 1990.
ELLIGER, W., *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung* (*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 15), Berlin 1975.
ERBSE, H., 'Pindars dritte nemeische Ode', *Hermes* 97, 1969, 272-291.

FÄRBER, H., *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München 1936.
FARNELL, L.R., *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (*The Gifford Lectures, Delivered in the University of St. Andrewes in the Year 1920*), Oxford 1921.
FARNELL, L.R., *The Works of Pindar*, 1, London 1930 (translation).
FARNELL, L.R., *The Works of Pindar*, 2, London 1932 (commentary).
FEHLING, D., *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin 1969.
FEHR, K., *Die Mythen bei Pindar*, Diss. Zürich 1936.
FENNELL, C.A.M., *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, Cambridge 1893^2.
FENNELL, C.A.M., *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*, Cambridge 1883.
FENNO, J.B., *Poets, Athletes and Heroes: Theban and Aeginetan Identity in Pindar's Aeginetan Odes*, UCLA Dissertation 1995.
FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO, M., see: GALIANO, M.F.
FERRINI, M.F., 'I termini di colore nella lirica greca arcaica', *ALFLI* 12, 1979, 167-192.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., *Aegina and Athens in the Archaic and Classical Periods: A Social-Political Investigation*, Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 1977.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., *Aegina, Society and Politics*, Salem (New Hampshire) 1981.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., 'Aeginetan Membership in the Peloponnesian League', *CPh* 76, 1981, 1-24.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., 'The Chronology of the Conflict between Athens and Aegina in Herodotus Bk. 6', *QUCC* 28, 1988, 49-89.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., 'Autonomoi Kata Tas Spondas (Thucydides 1.67.1)', *BICS* 37, 1990, 63-88.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., *Athens and Aegina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*, Baltimore & London 1992.
FIGUEIRA, T.J., *Excursions in Epichoric History: Aeginetan Essays*, Lanham (MD) 1993.

FILENI, M.G., *Senocrito di Locri e Pindaro (Fr. 140b Sn.-Maehl.)*, (*Biblioteca di Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 2), Rome 1987.

FILENI, M.G., 'Una pagina di storia agrigentina: Pind. fr. 118 e 119 Sn.-Maehl.', *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di B. Gentili* II (R. Pretagostini, ed.), Roma 1993, 427-440.

FINLEY, J.H., *Pindar and Aeschylus*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1955.

FINLEY, M.I., & PLEKET, H.W., *The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years*, London 1976.

FINNEGAN, R.H., *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*, Cambridge 1977.

FISKER, D., *Pindars erste olympische Ode* (*Odense University Classical Studies*, Vol. 15), Odense 1990.

FITZGERALD, W., *Agonistic Poetry: the Pindaric Mode in Pindar, Horace, Hölderlin, and the English Ode*, Berkeley 1987.

FLEISCHMAN, S., *Tense and Narrativity. From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (*Croom Helm Romance Linguistics Series*), London 1990.

FLOYD, E.D., 'Pindar's Oath to Sogenes', *TAPhA* 96, 1965, 139-151.

FLOYD, E.D., 'The Performance of Pindar, *Pythian* 8.55-70, *GRBS* 6, 1965, 187-200.

FOGELMARK, S., *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII*, Lund 1972.

FOGELMARK, S., 'Pindaric Bibliography', *Eranos* 74, 1976, 69-102 (supplement to Gerber and Rico).

FOGELMARK, S., 'Καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22', in: *Arktouros; Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M.W Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, M.C.J. Putnam edd.), Berlin & New York 1979, 71-80.

FONTENROSE, J., 'The hero as athlete', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* I, 1968, 73-104.

FORSSMAN, B., *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars* (*Klassisch-Philologische Studien* 33), Wiesbaden 1966.

FOWLER, B.H., 'Constellations in Pindar', *C&M* 37, 1986, 21-46.

FOWLER, B.H., *Archaic Greek Poetry. An Anthology*, Madison (WI) 1993.

FRACCAROLI, G., *Le odi di Pindaro*, Verona 1894.

FRÄNKEL, H., 'Man's "ephemeros" Nature According to Pindar and Others', *TAPhA* 77, 1946, 131-145 (= *Wege und Formen des frühgriechischen Denkens*, München 1960², 23-39).

FRÄNKEL, H., *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, München 1955.

FRÄNKEL, H., *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts*, München (1962) 1969³.

FRENER, G., *Kontrast und Antithese bei Pindar*, Diss. Innsbruck 1968.

FRIEDERICHS, K., 'Erklärungen zu Pindar', *Philologus* 12, 1857, 412ff; *ibid.* 13, 1858, 443-456 (on *P.*5.14-23, *N.*3.40-52, *I.*3/4).

FRISK, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1960.

FROIDEFOND, C., *Lire Pindare*, Namur 1989.

FÜHRER, R., *Formproblemuntersuchungen zu den Reden in der Frühgriechischen Lyrik* (*Zetemata* 44), München 1967.

GALIANO, M.F., *Píndaro, Olímpiacas*, 2 vols., Madrid 1944.
GALLET, B., *Recherches sur Kairos et l'ambiguïté dans la poésie de Pindare*, Bordeaux 1990.
GALLETTA, G., 'Epicismi in Pindaro', *Poesia epica greca e latina* (S. Constanza, ed.), Soveria Mannelli 1988, 77-111.
GALLO, I., *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro*, Salerno 1968.
GAMPER, J., *Die Zitate der Epinikien Pindars in der antiken Literatur*, Diss. Innsbruck 1971.
GARCÍA-RAMÓN, J.L., 'ὥτε and ὥcτε bei Alkman und Pindar', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46, 1985, 81-101.
GARDINER, E.N., 'Phayllus and his Record Jump', *JHS* 24, 1904, 70-80.
GARDINER, E.N., 'Further Notes on the Greek Jump', *JHS* 24, 1904, 179-194.
GARDINER, E.N., 'Wrestling', *JHS* 25, 1905, 18-22.
GARDINER, E.N., *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London 1910.
GARDINER, E.N., 'The Alledged Kingship of the Olympic Victor', *BSA* 22, 1916-1919, 85-106.
GARDINER, E.N., *Athletics in the Ancient World*, Oxford 1930.
GÄRTNER, H.A., 'Die Siegeslieder Pindars für die Sohne des Lampon', *Würzb. Jahrb. Altertumsw.* N.F. 4, 1978, 27-46.
GASPAR, C., *Essai de chronologie pindarique*, Brussels 1900.
GEDIKE, F., *Pindars pythische Siegeshymnen*, Berlin 1779.
GEHRKE, H.-J., *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das Dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*, München 1985.
GEHRKE, H.-J., *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, München 1985.
GELZER, T., 'Μοῦcα αὐθιγενήc. Bemerkungen zu einem Typ pindarischer und bacchylideischer Epinikien', *MH* 42, 1985, 95-120.
GENTILI, B., 'Aspetti del rapporto poeta, committente, uditorio nella lirica corale greca', *Studi Urbinati* 39, 1965, 70-88.
GENTILI, B., 'L'interpretazione dei lirici greci arcaici nella dimensione del nostro tempo. Sincronia e diacronia nello studio di una cultura orale', *QUCC* 8, 1969, 7-21.
GENTILI, B., 'Storicità della lirica greca', *Storia e civilità dei Greci* I, 2 (ed. R. Bianchi Bandinelli), Milano 1978, 383-461.
GENTILI, B., 'Verità e accordo contrattuale (cύνθεcιc) in Pindaro, fr. 20 Sn.', *ICS* 6, 1981, 215-220.
GENTILI, B., *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, tr. A.T. Cole, Baltimore 1988 (*Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica. Da Omero al V secolo*, Roma & Bari 1984, 1989²).
GENTILI, B., 'Die pragmatischen Aspekte der archaischen griechischen Dichtung', *AuA* 36, 1990, 1-17.
GENTILI, B., & LUISI, F., 'La *Pitica* 12 di Pindaro e l'aulo di Mida', *QUCC* 49, 1995, 7-32.

GENTILI, B., & BERNARDINI, P.A., & CINGANO, E., & GIANNINI P., *Pindaro. Le Pitiche*, Milan 1995.

GERBER, D.E., 'What Time Can Do (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.46-7)', *TAPhA* 93, 1962, 30-33.

GERBER, D.E., *A Bibliography of Pindar 1513-1966*, Cleveland 1969.

GERBER, D.E., 'Studies in Greek Lyric Poetry: 1967-1975', *CW* 70, 1976, 132-157.

GERBER, D.E., *Emendations in Pindar 1513-1972*, Amsterdam 1976.

GERBER, D.E., *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, Toronto 1982.

GERBER, D.E., 'Bacchylides 17, 124-9', *ZPE* 49, 1982, 3-5.

GERBER, D.E., 'Pindar, *Pythian* 11.30', *GRBS* 24, 1983, 21-26.

GERBER, D.E., 'Emendations in the Odes of Pindar: A Historical Analysis', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 1-32.

GERBER, D.E., 'The Gorgon's Lament in Pindar's Pythian 12', *MH* 43, 1986, 247-9.

GERBER, D.E., 'Pindar's *Olympian* Four: A Commentary', *QUCC* 25, 1987, 7-24.

GERBER, D.E., 'Short-Vowel Subjunctives in Pindar', *HSCPh* 91, 1987, 83-90.

GERBER, D.E., 'Pindar and Bacchylides 1934-1987', *Lustrum* 31, 1989, 97-269.

GERBER, D.E. (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 173), Leiden 1997.

GERHARDT, H.G., *Zeus in den pindarischen Epinikien*, Frankfurt 1959.

GERNET, L., 'Sur le symbolisme politique en Grèce ancienne: le foyer commun', *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* 11, 1951, 21-43.

GERNET, L., *Droit et Société dans la Grèce Ancienne*, Paris 1955.

GIANGRANDE, G., 'Interpretationen griechischen Meliker', *RhM* 114, 1971, 97-131.

GIANNINI, P., '"Qualcuno" e "nessuno" in Pind. *Pyth.* 8, 95', *QUCC* n.s. 11, 1982, 69-76.

GIANNINI, P., 'Lettura della *Pitica* 8 di Pindaro', *Lirica greca e latina. Atti del convegno di studi polacco-italiano (Poznan 2-4 maggio 1990)*, Rome 1990, 167-188.

GIANNINI, P., 'Note esegetiche alle *Pitiche* 6 e 8 di Pindaro', *QUCC* n.s. 49, 1995, 39-53.

GIANNINI, P.: See also GENTILI *et al.*

GIANOTTI, G.F., *Per una poetica pindarica*, Torino 1975.

GIANOTTI, G.F., 'Il terzo carme nemeo di Pindaro', *Atti dell' Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche* 109, 1975, 29-65.

GIANOTTI, G.F., 'Sull' olimpia seconda di Pindaro', *RFIC* 99, 1979, 26-52.

GIGANTE, M., *Nomos Basileus*, Napoli 1956 (repr. 1993 with appendix).

GILDERSLEEVE, B.L., *Pindar, The Olympian & Pythian Odes*, New York 1890.

GILDERSLEEVE, B.L., private letter to Charles Eliot Norton (May 22, 1898; now in the Houghton Library, Harvard University no. 1Ms Am 1088 [2684]), see: BRIGGS JR., W.W.

GOLDHILL, S. & OSBORNE, R.G. (edd.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge 1994.
GRANDOLINI, S., 'Sugli scolii del codice B di Pindaro', *GIF* 15, 1984, 301-307.
GRANT, M.A., *Folktale and Hero-Tale Motifs in the Odes of Pindar*, Lawrence (Kansas) 1967.
GRAVES, R., *The Greek Myths* (2 vols.), Hammondsworth 1960[3].
GRAZIA FILENI, M., see: FILENI, M.G.
GREENGARD, C., *The Structure of Pindar's Epinician Odes*, Amsterdam 1980.
GREINDL, M., *ΚΛΕΟϹ ΚΥΔΟϹ ΕΥΧΟϹ ΤΙΜΗ ΦΑΤΙϹ ΔΟΞΑ, Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des epischen und lyrischen Sprachgebrauches*, Diss. München, Lengerich i.W. 1938.
GRICE, H.P., 'Logic and Conversation', *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (P. Cole & J.L. Morgan, edd.), New York 1975, 41-58.
GRIFFITH, R.D., *Pindar. Narration as Knowing in the Victory Odes*, Diss. University of Toronto Ontario 1988. Summary in *DA* 49, 1989, 2646A.
GRONINGEN, B.A. VAN, *La composition littéraire archaïque grècque*, Amsterdam 1958, 1960[2].
GRONINGEN, B.A. VAN, *Pindare au banquet. Les fragments des scolies édités avec un commentaire critique et explicatif*, Leiden 1960.
GÜNTHER, H.-C., *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat & das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 180), Leiden 1998.
GUILLEN, L.F., *Píndaro. Estructura y resortes del quehacer poetico*, Madrid 1975.
GUNDERT, H., *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf*, Frankfurt 1935.
GYGLI-WYSS, B., *Das nominate Polyptoton im älteren Griechisch* (*Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 18), Göttingen 1966.
GZELLA, S., 'Problem of the Fee in Greek Choral Lyric', *Eos* 59, 1971, 189-202.
GZELLA, S., 'Pindar and Aegina', *Eos* 69, 1981, 5-19.

HAJDÙ, I., *Über die Stellung der Enklitika und Quasi-Enklitika bei Pindar und Bakchylides*, Lund 1989.
HAMBURGER, K., *Die Logik der Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1968[2].
HAMILTON, R., *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*, 's-Gravenhage & Paris 1974 (rev. M.R.Lefkowitz, *CW* 69, 1976, 340-341).
HAMILTON, R., *Selected Odes of Pindar*, Bryn Mawr Pennsylvania 1985.
HAMILTON, R., 'The Pindaric Dithyramb', *HSCPh* 93, 1990, 211-222.
HAMMOND, N.G.L., 'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C. V. The War between Athens and Aegina, c. 505-481', *Historia* 4, 1955, 406-11.
HAMMOND, N.G.L., *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, Oxford 1959.
HAMPE, R., 'Zur Eschatologie in Pindars zweiter olympischen Ode', Ἑρμηνεία, *Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag O. Regenbogen dargebracht*, Heidelberg 1952.
HANSEN, P.A., *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII – V a. Chr. n.*, Berlin 1983.

HARDIE, A., 'Pindar, Castalia and the Muses of Delphi (the Sixth Paean)', *Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Poetry, Etymology, Historiography* (F. Cairns & M. Heath edd.), Leeds 1996, 219-257.

HARRE, F.F.P., *De verborum apud Pindarum conlocatione*, Diss. Berlin 1867.

HARRIOTT, R., *Poetry and Criticism before Plato*, London 1969.

HARRIS, H.A., *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, London 1964.

HARRIS, H.A., *Sport in Greece and Rome*, London 1972.

HARRISON, J.E., *Themis. A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion*, Cambridge 1912.

HARVEY, A.E., 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry', *CQ* 49, 1955, 157-175.

HAVELOCK, E.A., *The Literate Revolution in Greece and Its Cultural Consequences*, Princeton 1982.

HEATH, M., 'The Origins of Modern Pindaric Criticism', *JHS* 106, 1986, 85-98.

HEATH, M., *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, Stanford (Cal.) 1987.

HEATH, M., 'Receiving the Κῶμοϲ: The Context and Performance of the Epinician', *AJP* 109, 1988, 180-195.

HEATH, M., *Unity in Greek Poetics*, Oxford 1989.

HEATH, M., & LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Epinician Performance', *CPh* 86, 1991, 173-191.

HEER, C. DE, Μάκαρ, Εὐδαίμων, Ὄλβιοϲ, Εὐτυχήϲ· *A Study of the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the End of the 5th Century B.C.*, Diss. Utrecht, Amsterdam 1969.

HEGYI, D., 'Athens and Aegina on the Eve of the Battle of Marathon', *AAntHung* 17, 1969, 171-181.

HEIMER, A., *Studia Pindarica*, Lundae 1885.

HEPP, C.F.T., *Pindars fünften nemeischer Siegesgesang übersetzt und erklärt*, Hrsg. von J. Gurlitt, Hamburg 1820.

HERINGTON, J., *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London 1985.

HERMAN, G., *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, Cambridge 1987.

HERMANN, G., *De dialecto Pindari observationes*, Lipsiae 1809 (= *Opuscula* I, Lipsiae 1827, 245-268).

HEYDENREICH, T., *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt*, Heidelberg 1970.

HEYNE, C.G., *Pindari Carmina et Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1798.

HEYNE, C.G., *Additamenta ad lectionis varietatem in Pindari carminum editione Gottingensi 1773 notatam*, Göttingen 1791.

HIERONYMUS, F., Μελέτη; *Übung, Lernen und angrenzende Begriffe*, 2 vols., Diss. Basel 1970.

HIGHET, G., *The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*, Oxford 1949.

HILL, D.E., 'Pindar, *Olympian* 8.37-46', *CR* 13, 1963, 2-4.

HÖHL, H., *Responsionsfreiheiten bei Pindar*, Diss. Köln 1950.

HOEY, T., 'Fusion in Pindar', *HSCPh* 70, 1965, 235-262.

HUBBARD, T.K., *Language and Mediation in Pindar and Heraclitus: A Semiotic Inquiry*, Diss. Yale 1979.

HUBBARD, T.K., 'Pindaric Harmonia. Pythian 8.67-9', *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 286-292.

HUBBARD, T.K., *The Pindaric Mind. A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 85), Leiden 1985.

HUBBARD, T.K., 'Two Notes on the Myth of Aeacus in Pindar', *GRBS* 28, 1987, 5-22 (on *I*.8.23-32, *O*.8.37-46).

HUBBARD, T.K., 'Pindar and the Aeginetan Chorus: *Nemean* 3.9-13', *Phoenix* 41, 1987, 1-9.

HUBBARD, T.K., 'The Theban Amphiaraion and Pindar's Vision on the Road to Delphi', *MH* 50, 1993, 193-203.

HUBBARD, T.K., '*Sophai Prapides:* Poet and Patron in Pindar, *Olympian* 11.7-10', *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 38, n.s. 13, 1994, 15-22.

HUBBARD, T.K., 'On Implied Wishes for Olympic Victory in Pindar', *ICS* 20, 1995, 35-56.

HUCHZERMEYER, H., *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik,* Diss. Münster 1931.

HUGHES FOWLER, B., see: FOWLER, B.H.

HUMMEL, P., *La syntaxe de Pindare* (*Bibliothèque de l'Information grammaticale* 24), Louvain & Paris 1993.

HÜMMERICH, F., 'Die Pindar-Handschriften B und D in Nem. und Isthm.', *Commentationes Philologicae,* München 1891, 115-128.

HURST, A., 'Observations sur la deuxième Olympique de Pindare', *ZAnt* 31, 1981, 121-133.

HURST, A., 'Temps du récit chez Pindare (*Pyth.* 4) et Bacchylide (11)', *MH* 40, 1983, 154-168.

HURST, A., 'Aspects du temps chez pindare', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 155-206.

HUTCHINSON, W.M.L., 'Two Notes on Nemean III', *Essays and Studies Presented to William Ridgeway* (ed. E.C. Quiggin), Cambridge 1913, 222-227.

HUXLEY, G., *Pindar's Vision of the Past,* Belfast 1975.

ΙΑΚΩΒ, Δ., see: ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, Γ., & ΙΑΚΩΒ, Δ.

ILLIG, L., *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung,* (Diss. Kiel 1925) Borna & Leipzig 1932.

INGRAM, J.K., 'On θαμά and θαμάκις in Pindar', *Hermathena* 2, 1876, 217-227.

INSTONE, S., 'Pindar's Enigmatic *Second Nemean*', *BICS* 36, 1989, 109-116.

INSTONE, S., 'Love and Sex in Pindar: Some Practical Thrusts', *BICS* 37, 1990, 30-42.

INSTONE, S., 'Problems in Pindar's *Third Nemean*', *Eranos* 91, 1993, 13-31.

INSTONE, S., *Pindar. Selected Odes. Olympian One, Pythian Nine, Nemeans Two & Three, Isthmian One,* Warminster 1996.

IRIGOIN-GUICHANDUT, J., *Histoire du Texte de Pindare,* Paris 1952.

IRIGOIN, J. (ed.), DUCHEMIN, J. & BARDOLLET, L. (trs.), *Bacchylide, Dithyrambes–Épinicies–Fragments,* Paris (Budé) 1993.

IRWIN, E., *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry,* Toronto 1974.

JANNI, P., 'Cώτειρα e cωτήρ in Pindaro', *Studi Urbinati* 39, 1965, 104-109.
JAX, K., *Die weibliche Schönheit in der griechischen Dichtung*, Innsbruck 1933.
JEBB, R.C., 'Pindar', *JHS* 3, 1882, 144-193.
JEBB, R.C., *Bacchylides, The Poems and Fragments*, Cambridge 1905.
JEFFERY, L.H., 'The Campaign between Athens and Aegina in the Years before Salamis (Herodotus, VI, 87-93), *AJPh* 83, 1962, 44-54.
JEFFERY, L.H., 'Aegina', *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Cambridge 1988², IV 364-367.
JOHNSON, W.R., *The Idea of Lyric: Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry*, Berkeley 1982.
JURENKA, H., 'Novae lectiones Pindaricae', *WS* 15, 1893, 1-34.
JURENKA, H., 'Humor bei Pindar', *WS* 18, 1896, 91-98.
JÜTHNER, J., *Philostratos über Gymnastik*, Leipzig & Berlin 1909.
JÜTHNER, J., 'Zu Pindar Pyth. 8, 96', *WS* 54, 1936, 142-143.

KAIMIO, M., *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature*, Helsinki 1977.
KAMBYLIS, A., 'Anredeformen bei Pindar', *Χάριc Κωνcταντίνωι Ι. Βουρβέρῃ*, Athene 1964, 95-199.
KEMPER, C., *Göttliche Allmacht und menschliche Verantwortung: Sittlicher Wert bei archaischen Dichtern der Griechen* (*Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* 14), Trier 1993.
KERENYI, K., 'ΑΓΑΛΜΑ, ΕΙΚΩΝ, ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ', *Demitizzazione e Immagine*, Padova 1962, 161-171.
KIENZLE, E., *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*, Diss. Basel, Kallmünz 1936.
KIERDORF, W., *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege: Studien zu Simonides, Pindar, Aischylos und den attischen Rednern* (*Hypomnemata* Heft 16), Göttingen 1966.
KIRKWOOD, G.M., '*Nemean 7* and the Theme of Vicissitude in Pindar', *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance* (ed. G.M. Kirkwood), Ithaca 1975.
KIRKWOOD, G.M., *Selections from Pindar. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (*American Philological Association Textbook Series* 7), Chico (California) 1982.
KIRKWOOD, G.M., 'Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician', *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury* (ed. D.E. Gerber), Chico 1984, 169-183.
KIRKWOOD, G.M., '*Nemean* 4,93 and Eris in Pindar', *QUCC* 60, 1989, 7-12.
KLEE, T., *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen*, Leipzig 1918.
KLEINKNECHT, H., *Die Gebetparodie in der Antike*, Stuttgart 1937.
KLOEPFER, R., *Poetik und Linguistik. Semiotische Instrumente*, München 1975.
KLUG, W., *Untersuchung zum Gebet in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, Diss. Heidelberg 1954.
KÖHNKEN, A., *Die Funktion des Myhtos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten*, Berlin 1971.

Köhnken, A., 'Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in Olympian 1', *CQ* 68, 1974, 199-206.
Köhnken, A., 'Perseus' Kampf und Athenes Erfindung (Bemerkungen zu Pindar, Pythien 12)', *Hermes* 104, 1976, 257-265.
Köhnken, A., 'Gebrauch und Funktion der Litotes bei Pindar', *Glotta* 54, 1976, 62-67.
Kolf, M.C. van der, *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus fabulas tractaverit quidque in eis mutarit*, Diss. Leiden, Rotterdam 1923.
Koller, H., 'Das kitharodische Prooimion. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *Philologus* 100, 1956, 159-206.
Kollmann, O., *Das Prooimion der ersten Pythischen Ode Pindars. Ein sprachlich-poetisches Kommentar*, (Diss. Innsbruck 1985) Wien & Berlin 1989.
Komornicka, A.H., 'Quelques remarques sur la notion d' ἀλάθεια et de ψεῦδος chez Pindare', *Eos* 60, 1972, 235-253.
Komornicka, A.M., 'La notion du temps chez Pindare', *Eos* 64, 1976, 5-15.
Komornicka, A.M., *Studia nad Pindarem i archaicną liryką grecką w kręgu pojęcv prawdy i fałszu* (*Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne*, ser. 1, 49), Łodz 1979.
Kramer, K., *Studien zur griechischen Agonistik nach den Epinikien Pindars*, Diss. Köln 1970.
Kranz, W., 'Sphragis', *RhM* 104, 1961, 3-46.
Kraus, W., 'Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum', *Wiener Studien* 68, 1955, 65-87.
Krause, J.H., *Die Pythien, Nemeen und Isthmien*, Leipzig 1841.
Krause, J., ''Αλλοτε ἄλλος: *Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schichsalswechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides*, München 1976.
Kriegler, H., *Untersuchungen zu den optischen und akustischen Daten der bacchylideischen Dichtung*, Diss. Wien 1969.
Krischer, T., 'ΕΤΥΜΟϹ und ΑΛΗΘΗϹ', *Philologus* 109, 1965, 161-174.
Krischer, T., 'Pindars Rhapsodengedicht (Zu Nem.2)', *WS* 78, 1965, 32-39.
Krischer, T., 'Die logischen Formen der Priamel', *Grazer Beiträge* 2, 1974, 79-91.
Krischer, T., 'Pindars achte pythische Ode in ihrem Verhältnis zur ersten', *WS* N.F. 19, 1985, 115-124.
Kromer, G., 'The Value of Time in Pindar's Olympian 10', *Hermes* 104, 1976, 420-436.
Krummen, E., *Pyrsos Hymnon: festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (I.4, P.5, O.1 und 3)*, Diss. Zürich 1987 (*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 35), Berlin & New York 1990.
Kuithan, J.W., *Versuch eines Beweißes, daß wir in Pindars Siegeshymnen Urkomödien übrig haben*, Leipzig 1808.
Kurke, L., *The Traffic in Praise, Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca (N.Y.) 1991.

KURKE, L., 'Fathers and Sons. A Note on Pindaric Ambiguity', *AJPh* 112, 1991, 287-300.
KURZ, G., 'Humor bei Pindar?', *Musa Iocosa. Arbeiten über Humor und Witz, Komik und Komödie der Antike, Andreas Thierfelder zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Hildesheim & New York 1974, 3-25.
KYLE, D.G., *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (*Mnemosyne Supplements* 95), Leiden 1987, 1993².
KYRIAKOU, P., 'A Variation on the Pindaric Break-Off in *Nemean* 4, *AJPh* 117, 1996, 17-35.

LACHNIT, O.W., *Elpis: Eine Begriffsuntersuchung*, Diss. Tübingen 1965.
LANATA, G., *Poetica Pre-Platonica*, Firenze 1963.
LANRETH, M.C., 'The Position of the Particles ἄν and κε(ν) in Pindar', *Eranos* 76, 1978, 13-18.
LASSERRE, F., 'Ornements érotiques dans la poésie archaïque', *Serta Turyniana: Studies in Greek Literature and Paleography in honor of Alexander Turyn*, Urbana 1974.
LATACZ, J., *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers*, Heidelberg 1966.
LATACZ, J., 'Realität und Imagination. Eine neue Lyrik-Theorie und Sappho's *phainetai moi kênos*-Lied', *MH* 42, 1985, 67-94.
LATTIMORE, R., *The Odes of Pindar*, Chicago 1947.
LAUER, S., *Zur Wortstellung bei Pindar*, Diss. Winterthur 1959.
LEAHY, D.M., 'Aegina and the Pelopponesian League', *CPh* 49, 1954, 232-243.
LEE, H.M., *Aspects of Pindar's Art. A Literary Study of Nemean II, Olympians XIV, XII and IV, and Pythian I*, Diss. Stanford Univ. 1972.
LEE, H.M., 'The *Terma* and the Javelin in Pindar, and Greek Athletics', *JHS* 96, 1976, 69-79.
LEE, H.M., 'The "Historical" Bundy and Encomiastic Relevance in Pindar', *CW* 72, 1978, 65-70.
LEECH, G., *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* (*English Language Series* 4), London 1969.
LEECH, G., *Semantics. The Study of Meaning*, Harmondsworth 1990².
LEEUWEN, J. VAN, *Pindarus' tweede Olympische ode*, Diss. Leiden, Assen 1964.
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The First Person in Pindar', *HSCPh* 67, 1963, 177-253 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 1-71).
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Bacchylides' *Ode* 5: Imitation and Originality', *HSCPh* 73, 1969, 45-96.
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'The Influential Fictions in the Scholia to Pindar's Pythian 8', *CPh* 70, 1975, 173-185 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 72-88).
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Pindar's Lives', *Classica et Iberica: A Festschrift in Honor of the Revered Joseph M.-F. Marique, S.J.* (ed. P.T.Brannan, S.J.), Worcester Mass. 1975, 71-93 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 89-110).
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., *The Victory Ode: An Introduction*, Park Ridge (New Jersey) 1976.
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Pindar's Pythian 8', *CJ* 72, 1977, 209-221.
LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'The Poet as Hero', *CQ* 28, 1978, 459-469 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 111-126).

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Pindar's Nemean XI', *JHS* 99, 1979, 49-56.

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar', *HSPh* 84, 1980, 29-49 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 127-146).

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'The Poet as Athlete', *Journal of Sport History* 11.2, 1984, 18-24; *SIFC* 3rd ser., 2, 1984, 5-12 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 161-168).

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'The Pindar Scholia', *AJP* 106, 1985, 269-282 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 147-160).

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Pindar's *Pythian* 5', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 33-58 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 169-190).

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?', *AJP* 109, 1988, 1-11 (= *First-Person Fictions*, 191-201).

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"*, Oxford 1991.

LEFKOWITZ, M.R., 'The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered—Again', *BICS* 1995, 139-150.

LEHNUS, L., *Pindaro, Olimpiche*, Milano 1981.

LEHRS, K., *Die Pindarscholien. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur philologischen Quellenkunde*, Leipzig 1873 (repr. Hildesheim 1971).

LENZ, A., *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos*, Bonn 1980.

LEUTSCH, E. VON, *Additamentorum ad Lud. Disseni in Pindari carmina commentarium specimen* I-IV, Göttingen 1865-8.

LIDOV, J.B., *The Structure of the Dactylo-epitrite in Pindar*, Diss. Columbia 1972, Ann Arbor 1973.

LISSARAGUE, F., *Un Flot d' Images: une esthétique du banquet grec*, Paris 1987 = *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wina and Ritual*, Princeton 1990.

LLOYD, G.E.R., *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought*, Cambridge 1966.

LLOYD-JONES, H., 'Pindar Fr. 169', *HSCPh* 76, 1972, 45-56.

LLOYD-JONES, H., 'Modern Interpretation of Pindar: The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes', *JHS* 93, 1973, 109-137.

LLOYD-JONES, H., 'Pindar', *PBA* 68, 1982, 139-63 (= *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy*, Oxford 1990, 57-79).

LLOYD-JONES, H., 'Pindar and the After-life', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 245-283.

LLOYD-JONES, H., 'Pindar, *O*.8.53', *CQ* 41, 1991, 240-241.

LOEW, O., Χάρις, Diss. Marburg 1908.

LONICERUS, I., *Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia*, Basel 1535.

LORIMER, H.L., 'Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology', *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, Oxford 1936, 14-33.

LOZZA, G., 'L' ambiguità di linguaggio nelle *Olimpiche* di Pindaro', *Acme* 29, 1976, 163-177.

MAAS, P., 'Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar', I, *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* 39, 1913, 289-320; II, *ibid.* 47, 1921, 13-31.

MAAS, P., 'ΗΡΩϹ ΘΕΟϹ', *MH* 11, 1954, 199.

MACHEMER, G.A., 'Medicine, Music, and Magic: The Healing Grace of Pindar's *Fourth Nemean*', *HSCPh* 95, 1993, 113-141.

MACLACHLAN, B., *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*, Princeton (NJ) 1993.

MACURDY, G.H., 'The Defeated Contestant in Pindar', *CW* 22, 1929, 83-87.

MADER, W., *Die Psaumis-Oden Pindars (O.4 und O.5): ein Kommentar* (*Commentationes Aenipontanae* 29), Innsbruck 1990.

MAEHLER, H., *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (*Hypomnemata* 3), Göttingen 1963.

MAEHLER, H., *Die Lieder des Bakchylides,* I. *Die Siegeslieder*, 2 vols. (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 62), Leiden 1982.

MAEHLER, H., 'Bemerkungen zu Pindar', *Hermes* 113, 1985, 392-403.

MAEHLER, H., *Die Lieder des Bakchylides,* II. *Die Dithyramben und Fragmente*, (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 167), Leiden 1997.

MALONEY, G., 'Sur l' unité de la quatrième Neméenne de Pindare', *Phoenix* 18, 1964, 173-182.

MANN, R., 'Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths', *GRBS* 35, 1994, 313ff.

MARCH, J.R., *The Creative Poet: Studies in the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry* (*Bulletin Institute of Classical Studies* Suppl. 49), London 1987.

MARG, W., *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung (Semonides, Homer, Pindar)* (*Kieler Arbeiten zur klassischen Philologie* 1), Würzburg 1938, Darmstadt 1967[2].

MARIOTTI, G.C., see: CALVANI MARIOTTI, G.

MATTHIAE, A., *Observationes criticae in tragicos, Homerum, Apollonium, Pindarum etc.*, Gottingae 1789.

MATZ, D., *Greek and Roman Sport. A Dictionary of Athletes and Events from the Eighth Century B.C. to the Third Century A.D.*, Jefferson (North Car.) 1991.

MAURACH, G., 'Pindarische Gliederungszeichen (*Nem.* 10 als Biespiel)', *Eos* 76, 1988, 217-235.

MAXWELL-STUART, P.G., *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology*, Leiden 1981.

MÉAUTIS, G., *Pindare le Dorien*, Neuchâtel 1962.

MEDDA, E., 'La lode della ricchezza negli Epinici di Pindaro', *SCO* 37, 1987, 109-131.

MEIGGS, R., *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972.

MEISER, O., *Mythologische Untersuchungen zu Bakchylides*, Diss. München 1904.

MERENTIOS, K.I., 'Ο Ἔρωϲ τῆϲ Πατρίδοϲ καὶ τῆϲ Ἐλευθερίαϲ παρὰ Πινδάρου, Athens 1967.

MERENTIOS, K.I., 'Ο Μηδιϲμὸϲ τοῦ Πινδάρου, Athens 1968.

MERKELBACH, R., 'Herakles und der Pankratiast', *ZPE* 6, 1970, 47-49.

MERKELBACH, R., 'Der unetschiedene Kampf des Pankratiasten T. Claudius Rufus in Olympia', *ZPE* 15, 1974, 99-104.

MEYER, G., *Die stilistische Verwendung der Nominalkomposition im Griechischen* (*Philologus*, Supplementband 16.3), Leipzig 1923.

MEYER, H., *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Diss. Köln, Würzburg 1933.

MEZGER, F., *Pindars Siegeslieder*, Leipzig 1880.
MICHAELIDES, S., *The Music of Ancient Greece, An Encylopaedia*, London 1978.
MICHELL, H., *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 1957².
MILLER, A.M., '*Thalia Erasimolpos:* Consolation in Pindar's *Fourteenth Olympian*', *TAPhA* 107, 1977, 225-234.
MILLER, A.M., 'Pindar, Archilochos and Hieron in *P.*2.52-56', *TAPhA* 111, 1981, 135-143.
MILLER, A.M., '*Phthonos* and *Parphasis:* The Argument of *Nemean* 8.19-34', *GRBS* 23, 1982, 111-120.
MILLER, A.M., '*N.*4.33-43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure', *CJ* 78, 1983, 202-220.
MILLER, A.M., 'Apolline Ethics and Olympian Victory in Pindar's Eighth Pythian 67-78', *GRBS* 30, 1989, 461-484.
MILLER, A.M., 'Pindaric Mimesis: The Associative Mode', *CJ* 89, 1993, 21-53.
MILLER, A.M., '*Inventa Componere:* Rhetorical Process and Poetic Composition in Pindar's Ninth Olympian Ode', *TAPhA* 123, 1993, 109-147.
MILLER, A.M., 'Nestor and Sarpedon in *P.*3.112-114', *RhM* (forthcoming).
MILLER, S.G. (ed.), *Nemea. A Guide to the Site and Museum*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1990.
MOLYNEUX, J.H., 'Two Problems Concerning Heracles in Pindar *Olympian* 9.28-41', *TAPhA* 103, 1972, 301-327.
MOMMSEN, T., *Pindaros. Zur Geschichte des Dichters und der Parteikämpfe seiner Zeit*, Kiel 1845.
MOMMSEN, T., *Des Pindaros Werke in die Versmaaße des Originals übersetzt*, Leipzig 1846.
MORETTI, L., *Inscizioni agonistiche greche*, Rome 1953.
MORETTI, L., *Olympionikai, i vinctori negli antichi agoni olimpici* (*Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 8), Rome 1957.
MORGAN, K.A., 'Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the Κῶμος', *CPh* 88, 1993, 1-15.
MORRISON, J., & WILLIAMS, R., *Greek Oared Ships*, Cambridge 1968.
MOSSHAMMER, A.A., 'The Date of the First Pythiad—Again', *GRBS* 23, 1982, 15-30.
MOST, G.W., *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (*Hypomnemata* 83), Göttingen 1985.
MOST, G.W., 'Des verschieden Gesinnten Sinnesverbindung. Zur poetischen Einheit der Alten', *Einheit als Grundfrage der Philosophie* (edd. K. Gloy & E. Rudolph), Darmstadt 1985, 10-29.
MOST, G.W., 'Pindar *O.*2.83-90', *CQ* 36, 1986, 304-316.
MOST, G.W., 'Two Leaden Metaphors in Pindar *P.*2', *AJPh* 108, 1987, 567-584.
MOST, G.W., 'Pindar *I.*1.67-68', *RhM* 131, 1988, 101-108.
MUGLER, C., 'La lumière et la vision dans la poésie grecque', *REG* 73, 1960, 40-72.

Mullen, W.C., *Pindar's Aeginetans*, Diss. Univ. of Texas, Austin 1972; summary in: *DA* 33, 1973, 3613A.
Mullen, W.C., 'Pindar and Athens. A Reading in the Aeginetan Odes', *Arion* 1, 1973/4, 446-495.
Mullen, W., *Choreia: Pindar and Dance*, Princeton 1982.
Müller, C.O., *Ægineticorum liber*, Berlin 1817.
Mulroy, D.D., *Early Greek Lyric Poetry. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary*, Ann Arbor 1992.
Murray, P., 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101, 1981, 87-100.
Musurillo, H., *Symbol and Myth in Ancient Poetry*, New York 1961.

Nagy, G., *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore 1979.
Nagy, G., *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore 1990.
Naiditch, P.G., 'On Pronouncing the Names of Certain British Classical Scholars', *CJ* 89, 1993, 55-59.
Nash, L.L., *The Aggelia in Pindar*, Diss. Harvard 1976, New York 1990.
Nash, L.L., 'The Theban Myth at *Pythian* 9.79-103', *QUCC* 11, 1982, 77-99.
Nebel, G., *Pindar und die Delphik*, Stuttgart 1961.
Němec, J., 'Pindar, Pythia VIII', *Eos* 45, 1951, 33-39.
Nes, D. van, *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos*, Diss. Utrecht, Groningen 1963.
Neubecker, A.J., *Altgriechische Musik. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1977.
Neuhoff, S. di, *Aegina* (*Apollo Editions* 25), Athens 1978[3].
Newman, J.K., & Newman, F.S., *Pindar's Art: Its Traditions and Aims*, Hildesheim, München & Zürich 1984.
Niekerk-Viljoen, G. van, see: Viljoen, G. van N.
Nierhaus, R., *Strophe und Inhalt im pindarischen Epinikion*, Diss. Leipzig 1936.
Nilsson, M.P., *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluß der Attischen*, Leipzig 1906.
Nisetich, F.J., *The Poetry of Victory: A Study in the Occasional Nature of Pindar's Odes*, Diss. Harvard 1973.
Nisetich, F.J., 'Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian 2*', *CSCA* 10, 1977, 133-156.
Nisetich, F.J., 'The Leaves of Triumph and Mortality: Transformation of a Traditional Image in Pindar's Olympian 12', *TAPhA* 107, 1977, 235-264.
Nisetich, F.J., *Pindar's Victory Odes*, Baltimore 1980.
Nisetich, F.J., *Pindar and Homer*, Baltimore & London 1989.
Norden, E., *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913.
Norwood, G., *Pindar*, Berkeley & Los Angeles (1945) 1974[3].
Nowottny, W., *The Language Poets Use*, London 1962, 1981.

Oelschlaeger, F., *Aliquot Pindari loci tractantur*, Suevoforti 1858.
Οικονομιδης, Γ. (transl.), & Ιακωβ, Δ. (ed., introd., comm.), Πινδάρου Πυθιόνικοι (Κείμενα Ἑλληνικά 7), Herakleion 1994.

OKSALA, T., 'Polymythia in Pindars Aigineten-Oden', *Arctos* 7, 1972, 93-105.
OLSON, S.D., see: DOUGLAS OLSON, S.
ONIANS, R.B., *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate; New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and Kindred Evidence also of Some Basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs*, Cambridge 1954².
OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN, 'ΟΥΝ, ΑΡΑ, ΔΗ, ΤΟΙΝΥΝ: The Linguistic Articulation of Arguments in Plato's *Phaedo*', *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage. Lysias & Plato* (C.M.J. Sicking & J.M. van Ophuijsen), *Mnemosyne Supplement* 129, Leiden 1993, 67-164.
ORTEGA, A., *Píndaro, Odas y fragmentos. Introducciones, traducción y notas*, Madrid 1984.
OSTWALD, M., 'Pindar, Nomos, and Heracles', *HSCPh* 69, 1965, 109-138.
OTTERLO, W. VAN, *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der Griechischen Ringkomposition*, Amsterdam 1944.
OTTO, W.F., *Die Musen und der göttliche Ursprung des Singens und Sagens*, Darmstadt 1956.

PARKE, H.W., *Festivals of the Athenians*, London 1977.
PARRY, A., 'Landscape in Greek Poetry', *YCS* 15, 1957, 3-29.
PAUW, J.C. DE, *Notae in Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia*, Trajecti ad Rhenum 1747.
PAVESE, C.O., 'Semantematica della poesia corale greca', *Belfagor* 23, 1968, 389-430.
PAVESE, C.O., *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica*, Roma 1972.
PAVESE, C.O., 'Le Olimpiche di Pindaro', *QUCC* 20, 1976, 65-121.
PAVESE, C.O., 'La Pitica VIII di Pindaro', *Studi di filologia classica in honore di Giusto Monaco* I, Palermo 1991, 143-153.
PAVESE, C.O., 'On Pindar *fr.* 169', *HSCPh* 95, 1993, 143-157.
PEARSON, L., 'Catalexis and Anceps in Pindar: A Search for Rhythmical Logic', *GRBS* 15, 1974, 171-191.
PELLICCIA, H., 'Pindarus Homericus: Pythian 3.1-80', *HSCPh* 91, 1987, 39-63.
PELLICCIA, H., 'Pindar, Nemean 7.31-36 and the Syntax of Aetiology', *HSCPh* 92, 1989, 71-101.
PELLICCIA, H., *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar* (*Hypomnemata* 107), Göttingen 1995.
PETERSEN, L., *Zur Geschichte der Personifikation in griechischer Dichtung und bildender Kunst*, Würzburg 1939.
PERNOT, L., 'Les *Topoi* de l'Élogue chez Ménandros le Rhéteur', *REG* 99, 1986, 33-53.
PÉRON, J., *Les images maritimes de Pindare*, Paris 1974.
PERROTTA, G., *Saffo e Pindaro; Due saggi critici*, Bari 1935.
PERYSINAKIS, I.N., 'The Athlete as Warrior: Pindar's *P.*9.97-103 and *P.*10.55-59', *BICS* 37, 1990, 43-49.
PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'Die Bedeutung von ἐκτελευτᾶν in Pi.*P.*12.29', *Mnemosyne* 44, 1991, 410-412.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'Pindarus: Vijfde Nemeïsche ode', *Hermeneus* 65, 1993, 180-188.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89, 1994, 305-317.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'Pindar's Eighth Pythian: The Relevance of the Historical Setting', *Hermes* 123, 1995, 156-165.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'The Date of Pindar's Fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' Thirteenth Ode', *CQ* 45, 1995, 318-332.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., Review of Willcock, *CR* 46, 1996, 216-219.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., Review of Instone, *CR* 48, 1998, 262-263.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., Review of Οἰκομίδης & Ἰακώβ, *CR* 48, 1998, 469.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'Bacchylides' Homer, His Tragedy, & His Pindar', *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 17 October 1997* (edd. I.L. Pfeijffer & S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1999, 43-60.

PFEIJFFER, I.L., 'Athletic Age Categories in Victory Odes', *Nikephoros* 11, 1998 (forthcoming).

PFEIJFFER, I.L., *First Person Futures in Pindar* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 81), Stuttgart 1999..

PHILIPPSON, P., 'Genealogie als mythische Form', *Symb. Osl.* suppl. 7, 1936.

PINSENT, J., 'Pindar's Narrative Technique: *Pythian* 4 and Bacchylides 5', *LMC* 10, 1985, 2-8.

PLACES, E. DES, see: DES PLACES, E.

PLEKET, H.W., 'Games, Prizes, Athletes and Ideology', *Arena* (now *Stadion*) 1, 1976, 49-89.

PLEKET, H.W., 'Zur Soziologie des antiken Sports', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands instituut te Rome* n.s. 36, 1974, 56-87.

PLEKET, H.W., 'The Participants in the Olympic Games: Social Background and Mentality', *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games (5-9 September 1988)*, edd. W. Coulson & H. Kyrieleis, Athens 1992, 147-152.

PODLECKI, A.J., 'Athens and Aegina', *Historia* 25, 1976, 396-413.

PODLECKI, A.J., *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times*, Vancouver 1984.

POHLSANDER, H.A., 'The Dating of Pindaric Odes by Comparison', *GRBS* 4, 1963, 131-140.

POLIAKOFF, M.B., *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*, Meisenheim 1982.

POLIAKOFF, M.B., *Combat Sports in the Ancient World: Competition, Violence, and Culture*, New Haven & London 1987 (*Kampfsport in der Antike. Das Spiel um Leben und Tod*, Zürich & München 1989, translated by H. Schmidt).

POLTERA, O., *Le langage de Simonide. Étude sur la tradition poétique et son renouvellement* (*Saphaneia* 1), Bern 1997.

PÒRTULAS, J., *Lectura de Pindar*, Barcelona 1977.

PÒRTULAS, J., 'La condition héroïque et le statut religieux de la louange', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 207-243.

POSTGATE, J.P., 'On the Nemeans of Pindar', *PCPS* 72-75, 1906, 4.

Poultney, J.W., 'Non-Concinnity in Pindar', *AJPh* 108, 1987, 1-8.
Privitera, G.A., 'Eracle e gli Eacidi nella III *Nemea*', *GIF* n.s. 8, 1977, 249-273.
Privitera, G.A., *Pindaro. Le Istmiche*, Milan 1982, 1992².
Privitera, G.A., 'Pindaro, *Nem.* iii, 1-5, e l'acqua di Egina', *QUCC* 58, 1988, 63-70.
Puech, A., *Pindare, Olympiques*, Paris 1931².
Puech, A., *Pindare, Néméennes, Isthmiques*, Paris 1923.

Raalte, M. van, see: Sicking, C.M.J., & Raalte, M. van.
Race, W.H., 'Some Digressions and Returns in Greek Authors', *CJ* 76, 1980, 1-8.
Race, W.H., *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Leiden 1982.
Race, W.H., 'Aspects of Rethoric and Form in Greek Hymns', *GRBS* 23, 1982, 5-14.
Race, W.H., *Pindar*, Boston 1986.
Race, W.H., 'Climactic elements in Pindar's verse', *HSPh* 92, 1989, 43-70 (= Id., *Style and Rhetoric*, 9-40).
Race, W.H., *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*, Atlanta 1990.
Race, W.H., 'How Greek Poems Begin', *YCS* 29, 1992, 13-38.
Race, W.H. (ed. & transl.), *Pindar. Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes* (vol. I), *Pindar. Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments* (vol. II) (*Loeb Classical Library* 56 & 485), Cambridge (Ma.) & London 1997.
Radt, S.L., *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian*, Diss. Amsterdam 1958.
Radt, S.L., 'Pindars erste nemeische Ode', *Mnemosyne* 19, 1966, 148-174.
Radt, S.L., 'Nieuwe benaderingen van Pindarus', *Lampas* 13, 1980, 389-405.
Raman, R.A., 'Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος. A Semantic Problem', *Glotta* 53, 1975, 195-207.
Raschke, W.J. (ed.), *The Archeology of the Olympics. The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, Madison (Wisconsin) 1988.
Rauchenstein, R., *Zur Einleitung in Pindars Siegeslieder*, Aarau 1843.
Rauchenstein, R., *Commentationum Pindaricum Particula Prima*, Aroviae 1844.
Rauchenstein, R., 'Zu Pindars Nemeen', *Philologus* 13, 1858, 245-263, 421-442
Rauchenstein, R., 'Erklärung der fünften nemeischen Ode Pindars', *Neues Schweizerisches Museum* 3, 1863, 243-254.
Rausa, F., *L'immagine del vincitore. L'atleta nella statuaria greca dall'età arcaica all'ellenismo*, Treviso & Roma 1994.
Redard, G., *Rechrches sur χρή, χρῆσθαι. Étude sémantique* (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* 303), Paris 1953.
Renehan, R.F., 'Conscious Ambiguities in Pindar and Bacchylides', *GRBS* 19, 1969, 217-228.
Richardson, N.J., 'Pindar and Later Literary Criticism in Antiquity', *PLLS* 5, 1985, 383-401.
Rico, M., *Ensayo de Bibliografia Pindarica (1800-1967)*, Madrid 1969.
Rijksbaron, A., *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek. An Introduction*, Amsterdam 1994².

RINGWOOD, I.C., *Agonistic Features of Local Greek Festivals Chiefly from Inscriptional Evidence*, Diss. Columbia 1917.

Robbiano, C., '. Persuasione, fiducia e arcaica passività', *Sandalion* 19, 1996, 21-32.

ROBBINS, E., 'The Broken Wall, the Burning Roof and Tower: Pindar *O.*8.31-46', *CQ* 36, 1986, 317-321.

ROBBINS, E., 'The Education of Achilles', *QUCC* n.s. 45, 1993, 7-20.

ROBBINS, E., 'Pindar', *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 173) (ed. D.E. Gerber), Leiden 1997, 253-277.

ROBERT, C., 'Die Ordnung der olympischen Spiele und die Sieger der 75.-83. Olympiade', *Hermes* 35, 1900, 141-195.

ROBINSON, D.M., *Pindar, a Poet of Eternal Ideas*, Baltimore 1936.

RÖSLER, W., *Dichtung und Gruppe. Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, München 1980.

RÖSLER, W., 'Realitätsbezug und Imagination in Sapphos Gedicht φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος', in: W. Kullmann & M. Reichel (edd.), *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, Tübingen 1990, 271-287.

ROHDE, E., *Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, 2 vols., Tübingen 1921[8].

ROMAGNOLI, E., *Pindaro. Le odi e i frammenti*, Bologna 1927.

ROME, A., 'L' humour chez Pindare', *BCH* 70, 1946, 524-532.

RUCK, C.A.P., & MATHESON, W.H., *Pindar: Selected Odes*, Ann Arbor 1968.

RUCK, C.A.P., 'Marginalia Pindarica', *Hermes* 100, 1972 (v: 'the poet's tardiness: *N.*3.80-1).

RUDBERG, G., 'Zu Pindaros Religion', *Eranos* 43, 1945, 317-336.

RUDOLPH, W., *Olympischer Kampfsport in der Antike; Faustkampf, Ringkampf und Pankration in den griechischen Nationalfestspiele*, Berlin 1965.

RUIJGH, C.J., 'L'emploi de ἦτοι chez Homère et Hésiode', *Mnemosyne* 34, 1981, 272-87.

RUSTEN, J.S., 'Γείτων ἥρως. Pindar's Prayer to Heracles (*N.*7.87-101) and Greek Popular Religion', *HSCPh* 87, 1983, 289-297.

SAÏD, S. & TRÉDÉ-BOULMER, M., 'L'éloge de la cité du vainqueur dans les épinicies de Pindare', *Ktema* 9, 1984, 161-170.

SANDYS, J.E., *Pindar*, London 1937[3].

SANSONE, D., *Greek Athletics and the Genesis of Sport*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1988.

SCANLON, T.F., 'Greek Boxing Gloves: Terminology and Evolution', *Stadion* 8/9, 1982/3, 31-45.

SCANLON, T.F., *Greek and Roman Athletics: A Bibliography*, Chicago 1984.

SCHADEWALDT, W., *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikions*, Halle 1928 (= *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse* 5.2, 259-343).

SCHADEWALDT, W., *Pindars Olympische Oden*, Frankfurt 1972.

SCHLESINGER, E., 'Notas a la Pítica VIII de Pindaro', *AFC* 7.2, 1960, 29-54.

SCHMID, E., *Πινδάρου Περίοδος*, Wittenberg 1616.

SCHMIDT, E.G. (ed.), *Aischylos und Pindar. Studien zum Werk und Nachwirkung*, Berlin 1981.

SCHMIDT, L., *Pindars Leben und Dichtung*, Bonn 1892.

SCHMITT, R., *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischen Zeit*, Wiesbaden & Hassarowitz 1967.

SCHMITZ, H., *Hypsos und Bios, Stilistische Untersuchungen zum Alltagsrealismus in der archaischen griechischen Chorlyrik*, Bern 1970.

SCHROEDER, O., *Pindari carmina*, Leipzig 1900.

SCHROEDER, O., 'Proben einer Pindarinterpretation', *JPhV* 44, 1918, 186-92.

SCHROEDER, O., *Pindars Pythien*, Leipzig 1922.

SCHÜRCH, P., *Zur Wortresponsion bei Pindar*, Bern 1971.

SCHULTE-SASSE, J., *Literarische Wertung*, Stuttgart 1976².

SCHWENN, F., *Der junge Pindar*, Berlin 1940.

SCHWENN, F., 'Pindaros', *RE* 20, 1950, 1606-1697.

SCODEL, R., 'Self-Correction, Spontaneity, and Orality in Archaic Poetry', *Voice into Text* (ed. I. Worthington), Leiden 1996, 59-79.

SEARLE, J.R., *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, Cambridge 1979.

SEGAL, C.P., 'Arrest and Movement: Pindar's Fifth Nemean', *Hermes* 102, 1974, 397-411.

SEGAL, C.P., 'Pindar, Mimnermus, and the "Zeus-given Gleam": the End of *Pythian* 8', *QUCC* 22, 1976, 71-76.

SEGAL, C.P., 'Bacchylides Reconsidered: Epithets and the Dynamics of Lyric Narrative', *QUCC* 22, 1976, 99-130.

SEGAL, C.P., 'Messages to the Underworld: An Aspect of Poetic Immortalization in Pindar', *AJPh* 106, 1985, 199-212.

SEGAL, C.P., *Pindar's Mythmaking: the Fourth Pythian Ode*, Princeton (N.J.) 1986.

SEGAL, C.P., 'Perseus and the Gorgon: Pindar *Pythian* 12.9-12 Reconsidered', *AJPh* 116, 1995, 7-17.

SEGAL, E., ' "To Win or Die": A Taxonomy of Sporting Attitudes', *Journal of Sport History* 11.2, 1984, 25-31.

SEIPPEL, G., *Der Typhonmythos*, Diss. Greifswald 1939.

SEVERUS, E VON, 'Gebet', *RAC* 8, 1972, 1134-52.

SEVERYNS, A., *Bacchylide, Essai biographique*, Liège 1933.

SHACKLE, R.J., 'Pindar, Nem. III. 59-63', *CR* 35, 1921, 28/9.

Shapiro, H.A., *Myth into Art. Poet and Painter in Classical Greece*, London & New York 1994.

SHAPIRO, M., *Asymmetry, An Inquiry into the Linguistic Structure of Poetry* (*North-Holland Linguistic Series* 26), Amsterdam 1976.

SHOREY, P., 'Φῦσις, Μελέτη, Ἐπιστήμη', *TAPhA* 40, 1909, 185-201.

SICKING, C.M.J., 'Organische Komposition und Verwandtes', *Mnemosyne* 16, 1963, 225-242.

SICKING, C.M.J., & RAALTE, M. VAN, 'Word-End after Long Anceps', *Mnemosyne* 34, 1981, 225-250.

SICKING, C.M.J., 'Pindar's First Olympian', *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 60-70.

Sicking, C.M.J., 'The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms, Especially in the Imperative', *Glotta* 69, 1991, 14-43 and 154-170.

Sicking, C.M.J., *Griechische Verslehre*, München 1993.

Sicking, C.M.J., 'Devices for Text Articulation in Lysias I and XII', *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage. Lysias & Plato* (C.M.J. Sicking & J.M. van Ophuijsen), *Mnemosyne Supplement* 129, Leiden 1993, 1-66.

Sicking, C.M.J., 'Aspect Choice: Time Reference or Discourse Function', *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (C.M.J. Sicking & P. Stork), *Mnemosyne Supplement* 160, Leiden 1996, 1-118.

Sicking, C.M.J., & Stork, P., 'The Synthetic Pertfect in Classical Greek', *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (C.M.J. Sicking & P. Stork), *Mnemosyne Supplement* 160, Leiden 1996, 119-300.

Silk, M.S., *Interaction in Poetic Imagery, with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry*, Cambridge 1974.

Simpson, M., 'The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes', *TAPhA* 100, 1969, 437-473.

Sitzler, J., 'Zum vierten Päan Pindars', *WKP* 28, 1911, 698-702.

Slater, W.J., *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969.

Slater, W.J., 'Futures in Pindar', *CQ* 19, 1969, 86-94.

Slater, W.J., 'Pindar's House', *GRBS* 12, 1971, 141-52.

Slater, W.J., 'Simonides' House', *Phoenix* 26, 1972, 232-240.

Slater, W.J., 'Doubts About Pindaric Interpretation', *CJ* 72, 1977, 193-208.

Slater, W.J., 'Pindar's Myths: Two Pragmatic Explanations', in: *Arktouros; Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M.W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, M.C.J. Putnam edd.), Berlin & New York 1979, 68-70.

Slater, W.J., 'Peace, the Symposium and the Poet', *ICS* 6, 1981, 205-214.

Slater, W.J., 'Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle', *CA* 2, 1983, 117-132.

Slings, S.R., '"KAI Adversativum". Some Thoughts on the Semantics of Coordination', *Linguistic Studies Offered to Berthe Siertsema* (*Costerus* 25, edd. D.J. van Alkemade, A Feitsma, W.J. Meys, P. van Reenen, J.J. Spa), Amsterdam 1980, 101-125.

Slings, S.R., 'Poet's Call and Poet's Status in Archaic Greece and Other Oral Cultures', *Listy filologické* 112, 1989, 72-80.

Slings, S.R., 'The I in Personal Archaic Lyric: An Introduction', in: *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric, Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (ed. S.R. Slings), Amsterdam 1990, 1-30.

Slings, S.R., 'Written and Spoken Language. An Exercise in the Pragmatics of the Greek Language', *CPh* 87, 1992, 95-109.

Slings, S.R., 'Figures of Speech and Their Lookalikes: Two Further Exercises in the Pragmatics of the Greek Sentence', *Grammar as Interpretation; Greek Literature in its Linguistic Context* (E.J. Bakker, ed.), Leiden 1997, 169-214.

Smith, B.H., *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*, Chicago 1968.

SNELL, B., *Die Entdeckung des Geistes. Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen*, Hamburg 1955³.

SNELL, B., *Poetry and Society*, Bloomington (Indiana) 1961.

SNELL, B., *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen 1962³.

SNELL, B. & MAEHLER, H., *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Pars I Epinicia, Leipzig 1987⁸; Pars II Fragmenta, Leipzig 1975⁴.

SNELL, B. & MAEHLER, H., *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis*, Leipzig 1970¹⁰.

SOMAZZI, M., *Index of Passages Cited in Bruce Karl Braswell, A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, Fribourg 1992.

SOTIRIOU, M., *Pindarus Homericus. Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*, Göttingen 1998.

SOUTAR, G., *Nature in Greek Poetry*, London 1939.

STAIGER, E., *Grundbegriffe der Poetik*, Zürich 1949 (1968⁸).

STANFORD, W.B., *Greek Metaphor: Studies in Theory and Practice*, Oxford 1936.

STANFORD, W.B., *Ambiguity in Greek Literarure*, Oxford 1939.

STANFORD, W.B., 'The Ending of the Eighth Pythian', *CJ* 37, 1942, 363-364.

STARR, C.G., 'Pindar and the Greek Historical Spirit', *Hermes* 95, 1967, 393-403 (= *Essays on Ancient History*, 175-185).

STARR, C.G., *Essays on Ancient History. A Selection of Articles and Reviews* (edd. A. Ferrill & T. Kelly), Leiden 1979.

STECHER, A., *Inschriftliche Grabgedichte auf Krieger und Athleten: Eine Studie zu griechischen Wertprädikationen* (*Commentationes Aenipontanae* 27), Innsbruck 1981.

STÉFOS, A., *Apollon dans Pindare* (Diss. Paris 1973), Athens 1975.

STEHLE, E., *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*, Princeton 1997.

STEIN-HÖLKESKAMP, E., *Adelskultur und Polisgesellschaft: Studien zum griechischen Adel in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*, Stuttgart 1989.

STEINER, D., *The Crown of Song, Metaphor in Pindar*, London 1986.

STEINER, D., 'Pindar's "Oggetti Parlanti"', *HSCPh* 95, 1993, 159-180.

STEINKOPF, G., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Ruhmes bei den Griechen*, Diss. Halle 1937.

STEINMAYER, O.C., *A Glossary of Terms Referring to Music in Greek Literature before 400 B.C.*, Diss. Yale 1985.

STERN, J., 'The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5, *CPh* 66, 1971, 169-173.

STINTON, C.W., 'Si Credere Dignum Est: Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others', *PCPS* 22, 1976, 60-89.

STOCKERT, W., *Klangfiguren und Wordresponsionen bei Pindar*, Diss. Wien 1969.

STONEMAN, R., 'The "Theban Eagle" ', *CQ* n.s. 26, 1976, 188-97.

STONEMAN, R., 'Mythology and Interpretation: Two Notes on Pindar's Nemeans', *Maia* 28, 1976, 227-132.

STONEMAN, R., 'The Niceties of Praise: Notes on Pindar's Nemeans', *QUCC* n.s. 2, 1979, 65-77.

STONEMAN, R., 'Ploughing a Garland: Metaphor and Metonymy in Pindar', *Maia* 33, 1981, 125-138.

STONEMAN, R., see also: CONWAY, G.S., & STONEMAN, R.

STORK, P., see: SICKING, C.M.J., & STORK, P.
STROHM, H., *Tyche. Zur Schicksalsauffassung bei Pindar und den frühgriechischen Dichtern*, Stuttgart 1944.
SUÁREZ DE LA TORRE, E., 'Parole de poète, parole de prophète: les oracles et la mantique chez Pindare', *Kernos* 3, 1990, 347-358.
SULLIVAN, Shirley Darcus, see: DARCUS SULLIVAN, S.
SULZER, A.-I., *Zur Wortstellung und Salzbildung bei Pindar*, Diss. Zürich 1961.
SVENBRO, J., *Le parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poétique grecque*, Diss. Lund 1976.
SVOBODA, K., 'Les idées de Pindare sur la poésie', *Aegyptus* 32, 1952, 108-120.
SWANSON, R.A., *Pindar's Odes*, Indianapolis 1974.

TACCONE, A., 'Sulla data dell' ode de Bacchilide per Pitea eginese', *BFC* 12, 1905/6, 253-255.
TAILLARDAT, J., *Les images d'Aristophane: Études de langue et de style*, Paris 1962 (corr. reprint 1965).
TAILLARDAT, J., 'Sur deux passages de la VIIIe Pythique (v. 67-69 et 77-78)', *REG* 99, 1986, 225-238.
TARRANT, D., 'Greek Metaphors of Light', *CQ* 10, 1960, 181-187.
THEILER, W., *Die zwei Zeitstufen in Pindars Stil und Vers* (*Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswiss. Kl.*, 17, 4, 1941), Halle 1941.
THIMME, O., *ΦΥCΙC ΤΡΟΠΟC ΗΘΟC.: Semasiologische Untersuchung über die Auffassung des menschlichen Wesens (Charakters) in der älteren griechischen Literatur*, Quakenbrück 1935.
THUMMER, E., *Die Religiosität Pindars* (*Commentationes Ænipontanæ* 13), Innsbruck 1957.
THUMMER, E., *Die isthmischen Gedichte*, 2 vols., Heidelberg 1968-9.
TODDE, P., 'Il problema dell' unità estetica negli Epinici di Pindaro', *Il Mondo Classico* 18, 1951, 129-142.
TOOHEY, P., 'Shades of Meaning in Pindar, *Pythian* 8.95-97', *QUCC* n.s. 26, 1987.
TREDE, M., *Καιρόϲ : l'à-propos et l'occasion*, Diss. Paris 1987.
TREU, M., 'Licht und Leuchtendes in der archaischen griechischen Poesie', *Studium Generale* 18, 1965, 83-97.
TSAGARAKIS, O., *Self-Expression in Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, Wiebaden 1977.
TUROLLA, E., 'Cκιᾶϲ ὄναρ', *Orpheus* 2, 1955, 183-189.
TURYN, A., *De codicibus Pindaricis*, Cracow 1932.
TURYN, A., *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Cracow 1948.

UNTERSTEINER, M., *La formazione poetica di Pindaro*, Messina 1951.
USENER, H., 'Milch und Honig', *RhM* N.F. 57, 1902, 177-195.

VALLET, G., 'Pindare et la Sicilie', *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31) Vandœuvres & Genève 1985, 285-320.
VALOZZA, M., 'Il motivo dell' invidia in Pindaro', *QUCC* n.s. 31, 1989, 13-30.

VAN, VAN DEN, VAN DER: see under the name following it.

VERNANT, J.-P., *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*, Paris 1965.

VERNANT, J.-P., *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne*, Paris 1974.

VERDENIUS, W.J., 'Pindar, Pythian 8.67-72', *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 367-368.

VERDENIUS, W.J., *Commentaries on Pindar, Volume I: O.3, 7, 12, 14* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 97), Leiden 1987.

VERDENIUS, W.J., *Commentaries on Pindar, Volume II: O.1, 10, 11, N.11, I.2* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 101), Leiden 1988.

VERDIER, C., *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare*, Innsbruck 1972.

VERMEULE, E., *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, Berkeley (California) 1979.

VILJOEN, G. VAN N., *Pindaros se tiende en elfde Olympiese odes*, Diss. Leiden 1955.

VILLEMAIN, M., *Essais sur le genie de Pindare et sur la poésie lyrique dans ses rapports avec l'élévation morale et religieuse des peuples*, Paris 1859.

VIVANTE, P., 'On Time in Pindar', *Arethusa* 5, 1972, 107-131.

VON: see under the name following it.

VOS, H., *ΘΕΜΙϹ*, Diss. Utrecht, Assen 1956.

WADE-GERY, H.T., 'Thucydides the Son of Milesias', *JHS* 52, 1932, 214/5 en 224/5 (= *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford 1958, 251/2, 265/6).

WAKKER, G.C., *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek* (*Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* 3), Diss. Amsterdam 1994.

WALKER, R.J., 'Pindar, Nemean III 62', *AJPh* 19, 1898, 315/6.

WALSH, G.B., *The Varieties of Enchantment. Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry*, Chapel Hill (N. Car.) & London (1984) 1988².

WEGNER, M., *Das Musikleben der Griechen*, Berlin 1949.

WEIDEN, M.J.H. VAN DER, *The Dithyrambs of Pindar. Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Diss. Nijmegen, Amsterdam 1991.

WEILBACH, M., *Die Formen der Aufforderung in der griechischen Lyrik*, Diss. Lengerich 1938.

WELCKER, F., 'Über den Plan einzelner Gesänge des Pindar', *RhM* 2, 1834, 364-390.

WELTER, G., *Aigina*, Berlin 1938.

WERNER, O., *Pindar: Siegesgesänge und Fragmente*, München 1967.

WEST, M.L., *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.

WEST, M.L., *Greek Lyric Poetry. The Poems and Fragments of the Greek Iambic, Elegiac, and Melic Poets (Excluding Pindar and Bacchylides) Down to 450 B.C. Translated with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford 1993.

WHITAKER, R.A., 'Pindar und die südafrikanischen *Iimbongi*-Sänger. Zwei Traditionen von Preisdichtung', *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur* (*ScriptOralia* Bd. 61, W. Kullmann & J. Althoff edd.), Tübingen 1993, 111-128.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON, *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*, Berlin 1913.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922.

Willcock, M.M., *Pindar. Victory Odes. Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*, Cambridge 1995.
Williams, F.L., *A Critical Edition of Nemean Odes 1-4 of Pindar*, Diss. Cornell, Ann Arbor (Mich.) 1976.
Williams, G., *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*, New Haven & London 1980.
Wilson, J.R., '*Kairos* as "Due Measure"', *Glotta* 58, 1980, 177-204.
Wilson, P., 'Pindar and His Reputation in Antiquity', *PCPhS* 26, 1980, 97-114. Winterscheid, H., *Aigina, eine Untersuchung über eine Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft*, Diss. Köln 1938.
Woloch, M., 'Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides', *CW* 56, 1963, 102-104, 121.
Woodbury, L., 'Truth and the Song', *Phoenix* 23, 1969, 331-335.
Wüst, E., *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter*, Diss. Tübingen 1967.

Yamagata, N., *Homeric Morality* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 131), Leiden 1994.
Young, D.C., 'Pindaric Criticism', *Minnesota Review* 4, 1964, 584-641 (= W.M. Calder & J. Stern [edd.], *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [*Wege der Forschung* 134], Darmstadt 1970, 1-95).
Young, D.C., 'Some Types of Scribal Error in Manuscripts of Pindar', *GRBS* 6, 1965, 247-273 (= W.M. Calder & J. Stern [edd.], *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [*Wege der Forschung* 134], Darmstadt 1970, 96-126).
Young, D.C., *Three Odes of Pindar. A Litterary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7* (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 9), Leiden 1968.
Young, D.C., *Pindar Isthmian 7: Myth and Exempla*, Leiden 1971.
Young, D.C., 'Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism', *CA* 2, 1983, 156-170.
Young, D.C., *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*, Chicago 1984.

Zunker, A., *Untersuchungen zur Aiakidensage auf Aigina*, St. Ottilien 1988.

INDICES

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS DISCUSSED

Ἄβας 539.
ἄβατος 289.
ἀβλαβής 539.
ἁβρός 146.
ἀβρότας 590.
ἀγάλλομαι 610.
ἄγαλμα 101, 200[5], 268-9, 617-8.
ἀγγελία 536.
ἀγένειος athletic age category 105, 175, 284, 386, 515.
ἀγέομαι 'leading' songs 139-40.
ἀγκών 171.
ἀγλαόκολπος 214, 356-7.
ἀγλαός 380.
ἀγορά 201, 227, 271, 619-24.
ἄγρα 416.
ἀγρότερος 343.
ἄγυια 447, 539.
ἄγω colourless verb? 32.
ἀγών 622-3.
ἀεθλ- synizesis 253, 553.
ἀεθλονικία 253.
ἀεθλοφόρος 420.
ἀθύρω 338-9.
αἴγλα 449, 599.
αἰδέομαι 119.
αἰδώς 67-8, 75.
αἰετός See: 'Imagery, image of the eagle' in the General Index.
αἰθός 534.
αἷμα 372-3.
αἰνίσσομαι 528.
Αἰολίς 408-9.
αἰπεινός 156-7.
αἱρέω
  ἑλεῖν 'winning' 188.
αἶσα 201-2, 272-3, 488, 627-30.
αἰχμά 528-9.
αἶψα 416.
αἰών 646-7.
  confused with ἐών 638.
ἄκατος 103.
ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος 59-60.
ἀκμά 322-4.
  ἀκμάν confused with ἀλκάν 322[156].
ἀκοίτας 147.
ἄκος 279.
ἄκρα 204, 302-3, 304.
ἀλάθεια 67-8, 75-6, 83, 87-8, 122-4.
ἀλαλά 215, 361.
ἆλιξ 173, 175, 515.
ἀλκά periphrastic 322.
ἀλλά
  substitutes 101.
  breaking off 304, 599.
ἀλλοδαπός 204, 302, 304.
ἄλλοι ἄλλα in 'summary priamel' 253.
ἄλλοτε ἄλλος 332, 573.
ἀλλότριος 311.
ἀλύσκω 496.
ἁμᾶ 63, 115.
ἀμείλιχος 483.
ἁμέτερος/ἁμός equivalent to ἐμός 244, 258.
ἀμοιβά 178.
  See also 'χρέος-motif' and 'πόνος-motif' in Gen. Index.
ἀμφέπω 221, 404, 406-8.
ἀμφί 518-9.
  c. acc. 'at, in' 561.
  adverb 585.
ἄν with subjunctive in relative clause 385.
ἀνά temporal 347.
ἀνατείνω 184-7.
ἀνατίθημι 509.
ἀνδρεία a 'Cardinal Virtue'? 639-42.
ἀνδρεῖος *vis-à-vis* θρασύς 166-7.
ἀνδριάς 101.
ἀνδροδάμας 324.
ἄνεμος
  ἶσα ἀνέμοις 342.
ἀνέφεδρος 447, 580-2.
ἀνεψιός 368.
ἀνήρ
  'any man' 311, 635.
  opposed to ἥρως 434, 507; cf. 203.
  athletic age category 105, 197, 216[39], 386, 515.

juxtaposed to a more specific noun 291.
scansion 388.
ἄνθος 108, 192.
ἄνθρωπος juxtaposed to a more specific noun 291.
ἀνορέα 227, 285, 592.
ἄντλος 486-7.
ἀοίδιμος 548-9.
soothening metaphor 398, 408.
ἀπαναίνομαι 158.
ἀπάορος 586-7.
ἀπότροπος 450, 452, 594-5.
ἅπτομαι 30-2.
ἆρα non-interrogative 149-50.
confused with ἄρα 149.
ἄραρα 173-4, 370.
ἀρετά 188-90, 218-20, 227, 382-3, 388-9, 435, 639-47.
ἀριγνῶτες 116.
ἄρμενα 358-9
ἁρμονία 442-3, 446, 559-61.
ἄρουρα 112.
ἁρπάλεος 553.
ἄρχω 259-60.
ἀσθμαίνω 346.
ἀσχολία 508-9.
ἀτελής 334.
ἀτιτάλλω 358.
ἀτρεκής 122, 124, 332-3, 477.
ἀτρεκές confused with ἀτρεκής 122.
αὐλός 278, 410, 500.
αὔξω/αὐξάνω 523.
θυμὸν αὔξων 358-9.
αὖτις/αὖθις 357.
αὐτόθεν 8[18], 129-30, 369-70.
αὐτός 'the same' 100-1.
ἄφθιτος 566-7.
ἄφθιτον confused with ἄφθονον 566-7.
ἀφθονία 257.
ἄωτος 631, 635-8.

βαθυμῆτα 353.
βαθυπέδιος 279.
βαθύς 'profound' 353.
βάλλω
of φυλλοβολία 546.
as a wrestling metaphor 572-6.
βάρβιτος 138, 264-6.
βία
physical 'strength' 128, 273.
'violence' 453, 468, 486, 492-5.
periphrastic 116.
of punishing gods 493.
βλέπω 558-9.
βοά 165, 375.
βουλά 426, 433, 470-1.
βούλευμα 148.
βραχυσίδαρος 342.
βρίθω 329.
βρότεος 388.

γᾶ 301.
See also ὀμφαλὸς γᾶς.
γαθέω value of perfect 314-5.
γάλα 220-1.
γαμβρός 162-3.
γάρ 372, 445, 474-5, 506, 538, 568.
following announcement 520.
See also μὲν γάρ.
γε
topic marker 271-2.
restrictive 223, 418.
γῷ confused with τ- 626-30.
γε wronly inserted 606.
See also γε μέν.
γείτων 441, 547.
γε μέν 222-3, 418-9.
γενναῖος 532.
γένυσι locative 106.
γεραίρω 109-10.
γέρας of athletic prize 577.
γεύομαι 333-4.
γλυκύς of song 103, 402.
γνώμα 450, 452, 594.
γόνος 358.
γύαλον 552.
γυῖον 166.
γυνή juxtaposed to a more specific noun 291.

δαίμων 167, 447, 448, 572-4, 577, 663-5.
δάκνω 587.
δεδαγμένοι confused with δεδαϊγμένοι 587.
δαμάζω
euphemism for 'killing' 297.
of athletic victory 578.
Δαναοί 362, 538.
δαπανά 277-8.
See also 'πόνος-motif' in Gen. Index.

δαφοινός 414-6.
δέ
anticipated by μέν 252, 313.
relation with *topic* 128[65], 137, 142, 155, 160, 222-3, 252, 267, 320, 336, 345-6, 413-4, 479, 506, 510, 535-6, 538, 550, 593.
'false' *topic shift* 479.
'layering' of *topics* 252, 538.
marking discontinuity 633.
after a greeting 399-400.
next independent step 25, 252, 270, 320, 337, 340-1, 357, 389, 395, 413, 416, 509-10, 546, 577, 633, 650-1.
next independent step resumed 392-3.
relation with implicitness 25, 27, 28-30, 74[25], 156, 252, 308-9, 336, 385, 413, 416, 577, 633, 638.
preceding position marked 136, 142, 252, 267, 268, 320, 336, 395, 404, 413-4, 479, 506, 510, 535-6, 550, 633.
on a par with subclause 270.
coordinating subclauses: 362.
coordinating two infinitives 190[216].
in parenthesi 394[300], 395.
wrongly inserted 388.
See also εἰ δέ, τὰ δέ, τὺ δέ.
δὲ καί 389, 494, 545, 546, 593.
δέκομαι
of the κῶμος 498, 500-2.
with σύν 165.
c. dat. 473.
δεξιός 253-5.
δέρκομαι 421.
δέδορκα 'shine' 421.
δή in question 37[67], 120.
δῆμος See 'Aegina' in Gen. Index.
διαγγέλλω 103.
διανέμω 551-2.
διαφαίνομαι 383-4.
διδακτά 324-8, 330.
δίδοι form 183.
δίκα
'the way it should be' 205, 450-1, 468, 566-7, 633-8.
aristocratic connotations 205-6, 432-3, 434-5, 444, 445-6, 453-4, 468, 566-7.
encomiastic propriety? 443, 565, 634[66].
Δίκα 426, 428, 443-4, 468-70, 565-6.
ἐν δίκαι 119.
δικαιόπολις 435.
δικαιοσύνη a 'Cardinal Virtue'? 639-42.
διόσδοτος 449, 451, 599.
διώκω metaphor 138.
διψάω 221, 251-2.
See also 'χρέος-motif' in Gen. Index.
δοκέω value of perfect 69[18], 129.
δόκιμος 262-3.
δόλιος 348.
δόλος 145, 580.
δόξα 505.
δορίκτυπος 215, 361.
δόσις 553.
δράω 473
δράκων shield symbol 437[28], 532-4.
δρόσος 404-5.
δυσμενής 484.
Δωρίς/Δωριεύς 246-7, 502.
Δώριος 164, 246.

ἐγκονητί 207, 229, 317-8.
ἐγχέσφορος 363.
ἐγώ 399-400.
ἐέρσα 220-1, 404-6.
ἔθνος 388, 611.
εἰ with optative 491-2.
εἰ δέ not conditional 127, 180, 225, 282-3.
εἰμί
ἔσκεν equivalent to ἦν 152.
in marked position before δέ 413-4, 509-10.
εἶμι
ἴτω τράχον and related expressions 513.
εἶπον See: λέγω.
εἴρα 624.
ἐκ See μόνος ἐκ. See also *s.v.* ἐλπίς.
ἕκαστον, ὅσα 561.
ἑκαταβόλος 550-1.
ἑκών See 'willingness' in General Index; cf. below *s.v.* νόος.
ἐλαύνω See ἐλάω.
ἐλαφρός 131, 133.
ἔλαχες confused with ἔλαβες 314.
ἐλάω/ἐλαύνω 218[45], 389, 480-2, 645-6.

ἔλεγχος 271, 382-3, 624-6.
ἐλέγχω 624-5.
ἐλεύθερος 451, 600-1.
ἐλινύω 100.
ἐλπίς 591-2.
  ἐξ ἐλπίδος 590-1.
ἐμπίπτω 582-3.
ἐμπρέπω 507-8.
ἐν
  'in comparison to' 388, 414.
  pleonastic 315-6.
  'sphere' of activity 315-6, 359.
  'on' musical instrument 410.
  wrongly inserted 343[192].
  wronly omitted 358[227].
  See also *s.v.* ὀλίγος, τάχος.
ἐναίρω 211, 343.
ἐνδόν 353-4.
ἕνεκεν 420.
ἐνελαύνω 480-2.
ἐνέπω 392.
ἐνέχομαι 537.
ἔνθα 8[18].
ἐξερεθίζω 488.
ἔξοχος 384.
ἐοικώς 283[83].
ἑορτά of religious festival 554.
ἑός 201-2, 272-3.
ἐπάγω 553.
ἔπαλπνος 583.
ἐπάμερος 596-7.
ἐπαυρέω 178.
ἔπειμι c. gen. 600.
ἔπειτεν 354, 357.
ἐπί 'at the time of' 590.
ἐπιβαίνω 285-6.
Ἐπίδαυρος See 'Epidaurus' in General Index.
ἐπιπρέπω 532.
ἐπίσταμαι c. inf. 476.
ἐπιχώριος 175, 375, 578.
ἐπιψαύω 30-2.
ἕπομαι
  colourless verb? 31-2.
  'following' precepts 632.
ἑπτάγλωσσος 137-8.
ἔργον
  ἔργωι emphasizing effort 445, 569, 579.
ἔρδω 473-5.
ἐρευνάω 298-9.
ἐρίζομαι 167.
ἕρκος 348.
ἔρχομαι c. acc. 530.
ἔρως 311.
ἐσλός 81, 446, 568, 630-8.
  ἐσλόν confused with ἐσλός 630-1.
-έτης 347.
ἔτι superfluous? 182.
εὐαγκής 176.
εὔανδρος 113.
εὐδοξία 328-9.
εὔθρονος 419.
εὐθύς 158.
εὐκλεής 378.
εὐμαρής 287, 289.
εὐμενής 441, 498.
εὐνά 150.
εὐρυσθενής 62[1], 77, 104.
εὐρύχορος 539-40.
εὐσέβεια a 'Cardinal Virtue'? 640-2.
εὔχομαι c. inf. subject continuity/ discontinuity 556-8.
ἐφάπτομαι 30-2, 549-50.
ἔφεδρος 447, 580-2, 664.
ἔχω
  confused with ἕξω 131.
  'having' knowledge 330, 352.
  ἔχει πόνον 618.
  ἕξει form 619.
  colourless verb? 32.

ζαμενής 215, 368-9.

ἦ 608-9.
ἦρα See ἆρα.
ἥρως
  ἥρως θεός 203, 228, 289-92.
  opposed to ἀνήρ 434, 507; cf. 203.
  juxtaposed to proper name 537.
  ironical 537.
ἡσυχία 426-9, 431-3, 441, 448, 452-3, 441, 446, 448, 452, 467-89, 569.
ἤτοι 80[37], 607-9.

θαμά 164.
θαμβέω 347-8.
θαμινός 343.
Θεάριον See 'Thearion' in Gen. Index.
-θεν ablative? 170, 250-1, 311-2, 501.
θεός 165.
  ἥρως θεός 203, 228, 289-92.

θέccαcθαι 113.
θιγγάνω 30-2, 504.
θνατόc confused with μακρόc 638-9.
θοόc 507.
θραcύγυιοc 522.
θραcύc 166-7, 212.
θυγατήρ with dative 262.
θυμόc
  ἀέξεται θυμόc/θυμὸν αὔξων 358-9.
  παντὶ θυμῶι 154.
  addressing the θυμόc 303.

Ἰαολκόν confused with Ἰωλκόν 316-7.
ἰδίαι 203, 297-8.
ἱερομήνιοc 245.
ἱερόc of games 245.
ἵκω See 'path-of-song' under 'imagery' in Gen. Index.
ἴλη 164-5.
ἵνα
  focus function slot 270.
  hinge? 43, 269.
  position 270.
ἴcα ἀνέμοιc 342.
ἵcτημι
  ἕcτηκα 'stand idle' 100.
  cτάcομαι value of future 121-2.
ἱcτίον 184-7.
ἰχνεύω 519-20.

καί
  makes for continuity 125, 132, 354, 357, 362, 639.
  belongs to the whole sentence 135-6.
  coordinates successive events 167.
  underscores parallelism 135-6, 389, 437, 473, 506, 545, 593.
  adverbial 494, 545, 546, 593.
  See also δὲ καί, τε καί, τε ... καί ... τε.
  See also *s.v.* cύν.
καιρόc 126, 427, 442, 448, 453, 476-7, 647-53.
κακόc
  κακὰ φρονέων 447, 583.
κάλαμοc 165.
καλλίνικοc 279-81.
καλόc
  of the victor 283-5.
  καλόν 'deed of excellence' 448, 517.
κάματοc
  See also 'πόνοc-motif' in Gen. Index.
καματωδέηc 278.
κάμνω 536.
καρδία 479-82.
καρχάcιον 184, 187.
κατά c. acc. equivalent to adverb? 558-9.
καταβαίνω 210, 226, 300-1, 332, 654-9, 662-5.
καταβλέπω? 558.
καταμάρπτω 207, 317-8.
κατανεύω 160.
κατελέγχω 521.
κε with subjunctive in relative clause 385.
κεῖνοc 610.
κελαδέω 375.
κεν See: κε.
κεράννυμι 30-2.
  See further μείγνυμι.
κερδίων 124.
κέρδοc 68, 75, 122, 433-4, 450.
κινδυνεύω value of perfect 119-20.
κίρναμι See μείγνυμι.
κλαίc 471.
Κλεώ See sub 'Muse' in General Index.
κληιδοῦχοc 471.
κλυτόc 293-4.
κνίζω 74[23], 155, 157.
  ἔκνιc- *vis-à-vis* ἔκνιξ- 511-2.
κοινόω 266-7.
κοίρανοc 367.
κολοιόc 417.
κομίζω 451, 600-1.
κονίζω 318.
κόνιc 318.
κόροc 510-1, 651-2.
κορύccομαι 570-1.
κόcμοc 312, 314.
κότοc 433, 482-3.
κραγέται 417.
κράζω 417.
κρατέω 175, 348.
κράτοc 173[177], 485.
κρέccων 310-1.
κρέων 116.
κρίνω 78[32], 584-5.
κῶμοc 193, 249, 373, 443-4, 498, 500-2, 561-6.

λαγχάνω
  ἔλαχεc confused with ἔλαβεc 314.

λαόϲ 539.
λαῦρα 447, 586.
λέγω
  impf. *vis-à-vis* εἶπον 118-9.
  εἰπεῖν 'command': 307.
λευκόϲ 220[47], 404.
λῆμα 419-20, 437, 531-2.
λίϲϲομαι
  with imperative 245, 557.
  with infinitive 557.
λιτανεύω 154.
λόγοϲ
  'account' 148, 631-2.
  'precept' 632.
  'praise' 378, 631-2.
  referring to direct speech 523-4.
λόφοϲ 176.
λύρα 137-8, 264-6.
λύτρον See 'χρέοϲ-motif' in Gen. Index.

μαίομαι 250.
μακραγορία 508-9.
μακρόϲ 129.
  of 'length' of story 509.
μαλακόϲ See μαλθακόϲ.
μαλακόχειρ 231[76], 354.
μαλάϲϲω 231[76], 273-4.
μαλθακόϲ
  'mild' attitude 426-7, 474-6.
  'weak' 274.
  'gentle' of song, voice 427, 474-6.
μάν 496-7.
μανθάνω with participle 487-8.
μάντευμα 550.
Μαραθών See 'Marathon' in Gen. Index.
μάρναμαι 81[38], 176-7.
μάρτυϲ 293-4.
ματεύω 311-2.
ματήρ 106, 447[56], 585-6.
ματρόπολιϲ 62[2], 110-1.
μάτρωϲ 605-7.
μάχα 'battle' with animals 211, 343.
μαχανά 518, 571.
μεγάλαυχοϲ 434, 494.
Μέγαρα See: 'Megara' in General Index.
μέγαϲ 467.
  μέγα βρίθω 329.
μεγιϲτόπολιϲ 426, 435, 467-8.
μείγνυμι 30-2.
  μείγνυμι χεῖραϲ 362-3.
  μείγνυμι ϲύν 403-4.
  vis-à-vis κεράννυμι 400-1.
μείλιχοϲ 600.
μέλι 220-1, 401-3.
μελίγαρυϲ 249.
μελίκρητον 403.
μέν 540.
  'layering' of *topics* 252.
  not answered by δέ 222-3, 418.
  position before marked 222, 252, 418, 506.
  See also γε μέν, τὰ μέν.
μὲν γάρ 506.
μένω 248, 337-8.
μέριμνα 379.
μέροϲ 388.
μετά 'in pursuit of' 322.
μεταΐϲϲω 609.
μεταμαίομαι 414-5.
μέτρον 126, 650-1, 659-65.
μή
  conditional 118, 569.
  generic? 117-8.
  signals caution? 117-8.
  with participle 117-8.
  with subj. 511.
μηκέτι 82, 182.
μήν See μάν.
μῆτιϲ 258, 613-6.
μιαίνω 272.
μιν and νιν
  μιν *vis-à-vis* νιν 154-5.
  redundant? 165.
  non-personal reference 264, 495.
μιϲθόϲ See 'χρέοϲ-motif' in Gen. Index.
μοῖρα 628-9.
Μοῖϲα See: 'Muse' in Gen. Index.
μόνοϲ ἐκ 538.
μόροϲ 628-9.
μόχθοϲ 178.
  See also 'πόνοϲ-motif' in Gen. Index.
μυχόϲ 578.

ναόϲ 552.
ναυτιλία 294.
νέμομαι 'dwelling' 418.
νέομαι 560-1.
  See also 'path of song' in Gen. Index.

νικαφόρος 507.
νίκημι 104-5.
νιν See μιν.
νίcομαι 164.
Νῖcος 175.
νοέω 125-6.
νόος
  εὐμενεῖ νόωι 498.
  ἑκόντι νόωι 554-5.
νόμος 355.
  in music 140-1.
νόcτος 300.
  of the athlete 584.
νύμφα 74[25], 158.
νυμφεῖος 150.
νυμφεύω 214, 355.
νῦν 536, 607.
νωμάω 534.

ξανθός 335-6.
ξενία, ξένος, Ξείνιος See 'guest-friendship' in General Index.
ξυνάν 147.

ὁ See 'article' in General Index.
  wronly omitted 638-9.
  See also τὰ δέ, τὰ μέν.
ὄαρος 263-4.
οἱ (dat. sg.)
  correption 322.
  position 322.
οἶκος
  οἴκαδε 368.
  οἴκοθεν 8[18], 206, 311-2, 537-8.
  οἴκοι 8[18], 175, 552.
  digamma 538.
οἰνάνθα 106-7.
ὄλβος 68-9, 127-8.
ὀλίγος
  ἐν ὀλίγωι 449, 593.
ὄλκας 102-3.
ὁμιλέω 30-2.
ὁμόcπορος 610-1.
ὀμφαλὸς γᾶς 548.
ὄναρ 598-9.
ὀξύς of the spirit 322-3.
ὀπαδός 255.
ὀπάζω 257-8.
ὀπᾶι 299.
ὄπις 558, 567-8.
ὀπίcω 368.
ὁπότε 530.
ὀπώρα 107.
ὅπως 366.
ὀρcινεφής 160.
ὀργά 74[23], 155.
ὀρθόβουλος 571.
ὁρμά 131.
ὄρνις 'omen' 537.
ὀρcινεφής 160.
ὅς See 'relative connection' in General Index.
ὅcα See ἕκαcτον, ὅcα.
ὅcπερ 526-7.
ὀcτέα 538.
ὅτι
  information status of ὅτι clause 543.
  position in verse 103[13].
οὐδέ
  antithetical? 308-9.
  effects implicitness 308-9.
  single, not sentence initial 488-9.
  See also τε ... οὐ ... οὐδέ, οὔτε ... οὐδέ.
οὐκέτι 182, 287.
οὐρανοῦ confused with οὐρανῷ 260-2.
οὔτε ... οὐδέ 586.
οὗτος anaphorical or cataphorical? 212, 349-51.
ὄφρα 359-60.
*ὄψ 250, 375.
ὀψέ 221-2, 410-2.

πάγνυμι 148, 363-6.
πάθα 536.
παῖς athletic age category 175, 284, 386, 515-6, 586, 662.
παλαιός 314.
παλαίcματα 519.
παλαίτερος 218-20, 227, 386.
παλαίφατος 270.
πάλιν 368.
πάλλω 133-4, 342.
πάνδοκος 551.
πάομαι 568.
παραμείβω 304-6.
παραμένω 528-9.
παραμεύβω See: παραμείβω.
παραcτάτας 320.
παράφαμι 153-4.
παρκείμενον 392, 645.
Παρναccίς 502.
πᾶς with or without article 176[182].

πάcχω 473-5.
πατήρ of Zeus 114.
πάτρα 522-3.
παύω 324.
παχέες See 'Aegina' in Gen. Index.
πεδάω 145-6.
πείθω with double acc. 147.
πεῖρα 218-20, 227, 271, 382-3, 386.
πειράω 150-2.
πέμπω 360, 400.
περ 412-3, 526-7.
περάω 289.
πέρθω 319-20.
περί
c. dat. 'at stake' 177.
περιcθενής 273.
πέταμαι 448-9, 592.
πετάννυμι 115.
πίπτω See πίτνω.
πίτνω 171, 504.
πλαγά 278.
πλᾶκτρον 138-9.
πλοῦτος See 'economics' in General Index.
πνέω 331-2.
πνοά 409-10.
ποία 192, 502.
ποιάεις 192.
ποιητός 75, 148.
ποικιλία 22-3.
ποικίλος 534.
of persons, plans 147-8; cf. 75.
of song 22-3; cf. 75.
πόλεμος 19, 68-9, 128-9, 426, 428, 433, 453, 467, 470-1, 484, 485.
πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος 59-60.
πολλά referring to intensity 154.
πολυνεφέλα confused with πολυνεφέλαι 260-2.
πολύξενος 245.
πόμα 408.
πόμπιμος 299-300.
πόνος 444-5.
πόνον ἔχει 268-9, 618.
'labour' of an armed conflict 569.
See also 'πόνος-motif' in Gen. Index.
πόντιος 318.
ποτανός 414, 448-9, 517-8.
ποτέ 113, 321, 527.
ποτίφορος 312-3.
πότμος 167-8, 628.
πότνια 199[2], 243-4.
πούς 128, 332.
'talon' 416.
τὸ ἐν ποςί and related expressions 512-3.
πρᾶγος 252.
πράccω 161.
πράccω φόνον 343-4.
with adverb 538.
πρέπω 217, 375-7.
πρόθυρον 192.
προοίμιον 143.
προcμένω 361.
προcτίθημι 378.
πρόcφορος See ποτίφορος.
πρόcωπον 123-4.
πρότερος 212-3, 270, 349-52.
πρόφρων 136-7.
πτῶccω 587.
πύκτας 188.
πῶμα See πόμα.

ῥαίνω 546.
ῥέζω 473.
*ῥηγμίν 116.
ῥιγέω 82, 183.
ῥιπή 360.

cέθεν 250-1.
cείω 595.
cεμνός 143-4, 380.
cθένος 165-6, 273.
cιδαρίτας 129.
-cκ- iterative? 152, 348-9.
cκιά 598-9.
cκοπός 147.
cοφία a 'Cardinal Virtue'? 639-42.
cοφός 569-70.
cτάcις 426, 428, 431-3, 441, 446, 453, 467, 484, 485.
cτόλος 274-6, 601-2.
cύ See τύ.
cυγγενής 168, 210, 328.
cύγγονος 452, 544, 549.
cυμμείγνυμι 30-2.
cυμπάγνυμι 75, 148.
cυμπρέπω 375-7.
cυμφορά 588.
cύν 377-8.
with abstract noun 477.
redundant 220[47], 377, 395, 403-4.

temporal 477.
'along with' 377.
cὺν πόνωι 569.
dat. καὶ cὺν dat. 602.
See also: δέκομαι cύν; *s.v.* τύχα.
cφάλλω 494.
cῶμα 345-6, 582.
cωφροcύνη a 'Cardinal Virtue'? 639-42.

τὰ δέ 336, 508.
adverbial or anaphoric? 572.
τὰ μέν 211, 336-7, 340.
ταπεινόc 417.
τάχοc
ἐν τάχει 161.
τε particle
makes for close connection 115.
both constituents having the same reference 115, 117[46], 253, 341, 358; cf. 267.
both constituents form one step in the sequence 341, 358.
inclusive 144.
position 267.
τε καί 510, 602.
coordinate different constituents 187-8.
τε ... καί ... τε 362.
τε ... οὐ ... οὐδέ 520-1.
τε pronoun? 50[103].
τέγοc 353.
τέκτων 179, 248-9.
τέλειοc/τέλεοc 505.
τέλοc 226, 299-300, 384.
τέναγοc 298.
τέρην 105-6.
τερπνόc 593.
τετράγονοc 641.
τηλαυγήc 370.
τήνελλα καλλίνικε 202, 280-1.
τίθημι 292-3.
τιμά 472.
τιc 225, 479-82, 597-8.
signalling metaphor 442, 559-60.
in a directive phrase 130.
τόδε deictic element soothening metaphor 398.
τόθι 552.
τοι particle 124, 611-3.
τοι pronoun *vis-à-vis* τοι particle 400.
vis-à-vis cοι 400.
τραχύc 483-4.
τρέφω 353.
subject is a location 507.
τριccόc 579.
τρίτον adverb 388.
τύ
vis-à-vis cύ 168-9.
τὺ δέ marks transition? 168, 550.
τὺ δέ false *topic shift* 479.
cε wrongly omitted 606.
τύχα 167, 445, 539, 566-7.
cὺν τύχαι 178.

ὕβριc 427, 433-4, 452-3, 467-9, 485-67.
ὑγιηρόc 279.
ὑμνέω 71-2.
ὕμνοc 373.
ὑμόc reference of plural 553-4.
ὑπαντάω/ὑπαντιάζω 441, 484-5.
ὑπέρ c. gen. 'beyond' 289.
ὑπέραλλοc 316[144].
ὕπερθε 572-5.
ὑπέροχοc 296-7.
ὑπέρτατοc 285, 471.
ὑπό
c. acc. 'close up under' 360.
c. gen. local 576.
ὑποcκάπτω 130.
ὑποχείριοc 576.
ὑψόθεν 583.

φαμί 'command'? 307.
φαόc 421.
φέγγοc 370-2, 600.
φέρω
colourless verb? 31, 280[74], 306[126], 309-10, 492, 524-5.
φιλέω 253.
colourless verb? 32, 253.
φίλοc 111, 434, 491, 600.
of poet and addressee 9-10, 220, 396-7, 491.
φιλόφρων 426, 468.
φόβοc having an effect on the φρένεc 324.
φόνοc 343-4.
φόρμιγξ 71, 137-8, 264-6.
φράδαcε 301.
φράζομαι 160; cf. 301.
φρήν 258, 322-4, 363-6.

φρονέω
  κακὰ φρονέων *et sim.* 447, 583.
φυά 210, 324-8, 331.
φύλαξ 547.
φυλλοβολία 546.

χαῖρε 220, 396-8, 399-400.
χαλκότοξον 321-2.
χαμαί 593.
χαρίειϲ 268-9, 619.
χάριϲ 193, 585.
  See also 'χρέοϲ-motif' in Gen. Index.
Χάριτεϲ See 'Graces' in Gen. Ind.
χάρμα 375, 552.
χεῖρ 128.
  μείγνυμι χεῖραϲ 362-3.
  ὑπὸ χείρων 575-6.
  χερϲί redundant? 342-3.
χόλοϲ *vis-à-vis* κότοϲ 482-3.
χρέοϲ 513-5.
  See also 'χρέοϲ-motif' in Gen. Index.
χρόνοϲ 347.
  ἐν χρόνωι 433[22], 434, 493-4.
χρυϲαλάκατοϲ 161-2
χρύϲεοϲ / χρυϲόϲ 109, 139.

ψαύω 30-2, 172.
ψευϲτάϲ 148.
ψεφηνόϲ 330-1.

ὦ
  position 470.
  with crasis 579.
ὠκύϲ 222.
ὥϲτε 100, 161.

GENERAL INDEX

Abas: 539.
Abbruchsformel. See: break off.
'Ablative' expression referring to the place where the victory was won: 169-70, 501. See further -θεν in the Index of Greek Words.
Absolute genitive. See: genitive absolute.
'Abstract'. See: narrative technique.
Acastus. See: Peleus.
Achilles. His childhood: 211-3, 335, 337-51; before Troy: 207, 208, 211-6, 230, 360-70.
Actio: 151-2, 161[149], 530.
Adjective derived from proper name: 499-500.
Adrastus: 436, 438-40, 452, 525-6, 534-9.
Aeacids. Presented as Aeginetan ancestors: 80, 86, 109, 204, 224-5, 372, 434-5, 507, 610; mentioned in every Aeginetan ode: 109, 307-8, 435, 436; their strength is proverbial: 109; cf. 506. See further: Achilles, Peleus, Phocus, Telamon.
Aeacus. Hosting Greek envoys: 63, 113-4, 192; his shrine in Aegina: 8[15], 84, 113[38], 191-2; mentioned in every Aeginetan ode: 109, 307-8; emblem of δικαιοϲύνη 435, 505.
Aegae: 163.
Aegialeus. Son of Adrastus: 436, 438, 452, 526, 534, 537-9.
Aegina. Dorian: 246-7, 502; called Oenona or Oenopia: 121, 248; naval supremacy: 62-3, 77, 102, 111, 112, 228, 451; piratry: 59-60, 102; importance of *xenia:* 62-88, 111-2; tensions between δῆμοϲ and παχέεϲ: 66-88, 430-56, 523[78], 570; relation with Argos: 436[25]; Aeginetan 'clans': 436, 439, 522-3; river Asopus: 247-8; altar of Zeus Hellenius: 63, 113-4; Aeaceum: 8[15], 84, 113[38], 191-2; Thearion: 8[15], 380-2 (see further: *thearos*); local Aeginetan games: 79-81, 169-70; Delphinian games: 80-1, 169-70, 174-5, 442, 552-4; Heraea: 170, 445, 447, 578; the nymph Aegina: 110, 121, 248, 600. For Aegina's relation with Athens: see Athens.
Aeolian mode: 408-9.
Aesthetic admiration for Pi.'s poetry: vi; as an influence on Pindaric criticism: 1-2, 6-7.
Aetna. See: Etna.
Age. Athletic age categories: 105, 173, 175, 197, 216[39], 284, 386, 515-6, 586, 662; ages associated with specific ἀρεταί: 643-5; See also: '*puer-senex*' motif.
Aktionsart. See: *actio.*
Alcmaeon. Son of Amphiaraus: 436-41, 447[56], 448, 452, 523-6, 529, 532-4, 540-9.
Alliteration. See: sound effect.
Amazons: 209, 321-2.
Ambiguity. See: polyinterpretability.
Amphiaraeon: 542-4, 547.
Amphiaraus: 436-41, 452, 523-46.
Anaphora: 479.
Anthropological approaches to Pi.: 11-2, 584.
Aorist tense. See: aspect, past tense.
'Ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction: 378, 590.
Apollo. God of Music: 442, 559; Musagetes: 71, 138-41; plays the *phorminx:* 138; or the lyre: 550-1; patron of the Pythian Games: 427, 434, 441, 442, 497-8, 501-2, 550, 552, 577; killed Porphyrion: 427, 434, 441, 488, 490, 492-3, 497-8; Delphinios: 174-5, 442, 552; 'far-shooter': 550-1.
Apostrophe: 103, 397[304]. See also: invocation.
Archilochus. Quoted by Pi.: 280.
Argos. Relation with Aegina: 436[25].
Artemis: 212, 553-4.

Article. With infinitive: 126; αὐτόϲ 'the same' without article: 100-1; πᾶϲ with or without article: 176[182]; article with genitive (ὁ τᾶϲ θεοῦ): 116; use of article with proper name presents the entity referred to as familiar to the addressee: 245; absence of article makes reference generic: 120-1; wrongly omitted: 638-9.
Asclepiea. See: Epidaurus.
Asclepius: 213-4, 231[76], 354.
Asopus: 247-8.
Aspect. Imperfect *vis-à-vis* aorist explained by pragmatic function of the verb: 104-5, 136, 151-2, 258, 343, 527 (see also: zero option); of the clause as a whole: 139-40, 270, 300-1, 502; by structure of the narrative: 154, 157, 296-7, 344; by avoidance of ambiguity: 298-9; by lexicalized difference: 118-9; by lack of alternative: 260; imperfect of repeated action?: 344; present tense imperative refers to continuation of action: 82, 182, 258, 451, 600-1; postposed aorist participle clause provides external motivation: 158; aorist participle does not refer to an anterior action: 527; gnomic aorist: 175, 494.
Asymmetry. See: *inconcinnitas*.
Asyndeton. Effects implicitness: 27, 131, 311; occurs with fresh start: 303, 340-1, 353, 372, 395, 399; with shift regarding the type of utterance: 303-4; with demonstrative pronoun: 394.
Athena: 212.
Athens. Relation with Aegina: naval rivalry with Aegina: 59-60, 82, 429, 487; war with Aegina (487 B.C.): 19, 59-61, 66-88, 177; forces Aegina to join the Delian League after Oenophyta (457 B.C.): 197, 425, 429, 432, 434, 439-40; almost loses control over Aegina after Coronea (447 B.C.): 19, 197-8, 428[6], 430-4, 439-40, 445, 451, 601; restores domination of Aegina with Thirty Years Peace (446/5 B.C.): 198, 428[4], 451[62], 455-6.
Attraction. Of the relative: 385.
Audience. Listening audience perceives text linearly: 40, 41-52, 161, 269, 287, 292, 339-41, 395-6, 471, 474[6], 477, 492-3, 495, 538-9, 549, 575[197], 590, 632; involved actively in construction of meaning: 25, 28, 31, 32, 50, 52, 53-4, 65, 440-1, 503, 524-5, 535; Pi. draws on the audience's knowledge of the myth: 145, 436, 497, 535; of the circumstances of the victory: 8-9, 173; kept in suspense: 41-54 (see further: suspense); first and later audiences: 7-11, 102, 141; Pi. imitates the jargon of his audience?: 184. See further: performance.
Aulos: 278, 410, 500.
Authority. Pi. refers to earlier authorities: 45, 199, 212-3, 349-52. See further: Hesiod, Homer.

Bacchylides. His *ethos* compared to Pi.'s: 9, 59, 78, 83; his usage of the relative connection compared to Pi.'s: 41[76]; his use of retardation compared to Pi.'s: 43[82], 45; his concern for suspense compared to Pi.'s: 45; his break offs compared to Pi.'s: 45, 133[79], 303; his *pathos* compared to Pi.'s: 47; his use of the πόνοϲ-motif compared to Pi.'s: 277[71]; his homo-eroticism compared to Pi.'s: 284; his views on inherited excellence compared to Pi.'s: 78, 328; his mentioning of details of the contest: 579-80.
Barbitos: 138, 264-6; played with a plectrum: 138-9.
Beard. As symbol of maturity: 107-8.
Beauty. Reference to victor's beauty: 202, 283-5, 336, 642.
Bee. See: imagery.
Break off passages. Misunderstood: 34-5, 64, 117-8, 224; contribute to the fictional mimesis of *ex tempore* speech: 35-6, 64-5, 117-8, 224, 314-5, 435, 651; with a wish, prayer or self-exhortation: 130, 303-4, 313; with the *ne plus ultra* motif: 287-9, 391-2; with reference to earlier authorities:

352; element of irony: 36-7, 64, 120, 206, 311; generates suspense: 42-4; charged with emotion: 45, 302-3, 306; break off of the type 'too much to tell': 42[79], 125, 126, 435, 508-9; break off is an example of recommended silence: 88; break off in Bacchylides: 45; 133[79].

Carnea. See: Cyrene.
Chariot. See: imagery.
Charites. See: Graces.
Chiron. Lives on Mt. Pelion: 137, 214, 353; tutor of Achilles and others: 211, 213-5, 228-9, 335, 337, 353-4; saves Peleus from being killed: 144; advises Peleus how to subdue Thetis: 214, 229-30; hosts the wedding of Peleus and Thetis: 137, 159, 208, 214, 355; gives a spear to Peleus: 44, 207, 229, 316; is portrayed as a trainer: 229-30.
Chorus. Mentioned explicitly: 248-9, 263-4, 375; Aeginetan chorus represents Aegina as a whole: 88, 206, 431-56, 514. See further: first person, performance.
Χρέοc-motif: 205[13], 217, 251, 377, 444, 513-5, 634.
Circular composition. See: ring composition.
Cirrha: 501.
Cithara. See: *kithara.*
Civil war: 426, 428, 467, 484, 485; in Aegina?: 431-3, 441, 446, 453; in Cnossos: 7.
Clausula. See: metre.
Clio. See: Muse.
Cnossos. Civil war: 7.
Coat of arms. See: shield emblem.
Colonization: 62[2], 110-1.
Colourless verbs: 31-2, 192-3, 253, 280[74], 306[126], 309-10, 492, 524-5.
Complexity: 76.
Conditional clause. See εἰ δέ in Index of Greek Words.
Contestants. See: opponents.
Convention. Rhetorical conventions *vis-à-vis* historical allusions: 4-6, 20, 226.
Coronea. Battle. See: Athens.
Correption: 322.
Credentials. See: poetic credentials.
Crocky-Wock: 637.
Crown. Dedication: see dedication of crown.
Cumae. Battle: 8.
Cyrene. Carnea: 8[16].

Dactylo-epitrites. See: metre.
Danai: 362, 538.
Dance. Tempo of dance: 47, 49; choral dancing during opening ceremony? 165[159].
Dardanians: 362.
Dative. With locative force: 105-6, 187; with a verb of movement: 193; with δέκομαι: 473; 'possessive' qualifying a noun: 262.
Dedication. Of the victory, crown, or ode: 84, 180, 190-3, 426-7, 468, 471-3.
Defeated contestants. See: opponents.
Deictic reference. From perspective of first performance: 8, 175, 311, 369-70, 398, 552, 578; to venue of the performance: 129-30, 311, 369-70; to the performance itself: 562; to 'this point in the ode': 129; ambiguous deictic reference effects irony: 206, 311; deixis 'soothens' metaphor: 398; variation of deictic elements in opening and closing speech cappings: 531.
Delay. In the delivery of the ode: 19-20, 197, 221-2, 245, 410-2.
Delphi. Venue of the Pythian games: 501, 550; importance of the venue emphasized: 551; omphalos: 548; oracle: 549.
Delphinian games. See: Aegina.
Dew. See: song.
Didactic element of Pi.'s odes. See: warning.
Difficulty. See: *obscuritas.*
Dika. See: δίκα in Index of Greek Words.
Diversity. Structural diversity as a characteristic of Pi.'s style: 22-3, 33, 53-4; variations of mood: 45-7, 77-8, 115, 447-8, 478, 498, 539; variations of tempo: 47-9, 506, 585[205]; varia-

tions in speech caps: 531; diversity thematized: 22, 221, 248-9, 398-9, 402.
Dorian. Of the Isthmus: 164; of Aegina: 246-7; of an Aeginetan κῶμος: 502.
Drink. See: song.

Eagle. See: imagery.
Echo. Verbal correspondance: 71, 200[3], 211[29], 217, 221, 226, 229, 231[76], 300, 334, 435, 441, 447, 448-9, 502, 504, 517, 532, 539, 565-6, 574, 583, 592, 593; echo of rhythmical sequences: 95-7, 237-40, 463-6. See also: ring composition.
Economics. Pi. hides the mercantile aspect of his art: 36, 513, 555; thematizes it elsewhere: 36[65], 122; wealth is a condition for athletic success: 277-8; wealth must be used in the right way: 448-50, 453, 588-9 (cf. 433-4, 454).
Electrae gate. See: Thebes.
Emotion. In break off passages: 45, 302-3, 306; Pi.'s emotional commitment to his patron: 9; contrasting emotions: 45-7, 77-8, 115, 447-8, 478, 498, 539.
Enallage: 105.
'Encomiastic' conditional. See: warning.
'Encomiastic' future. See: future tense.
Enjambment: 152, 296, 396[301].
Envy: 257[39], 426[2], 510-1.
Epic. See: Homer.
Epic correption. See: correption.
Epidaurus. Asclepian games: 187, 214, 223, 420-1.
Epigonoi. Expedition against Thebes: 436-40, 452, 525-34, 536-8.
Epiphany. Of Amphiaraus: 436, 438, 527, 545; of Alcmaeon: 436-8, 440-1, 540-5, 547-8.
Ethiopians: 215-6, 227, 289, 362, 366-7, 369-70.
Etna. Volcano: 8; city: 8.
Etymology. See: pun.
Exile: 19, 62[2], 66, 86-7, 111, 117, 120.

Family tie. Between poet and patron: 9-10; between poet and Muse: 244; victor's family ties treated as familiar to the audience: 8. See further: inherited excellence.
Farblose Zeitwörter. See: colourless verbs.
Fictional mimesis of *ex tempore* speech. In break off passages: 34-7, 64-5, 117-8, 133[79], 314-5, 651; in introducing myths: 37-41, 76-7, 163; or other sections: 498, 502; in carrying on the narrative too far: 438, 523-4, 528, 545-6; effected by *inconcinnitas:* 52; by *zeugma:* 502-3; ties in with fiction of spontaneity: 35-6, 53-4, 64-5, 502-3; is a tool for creating diversity: 35, 53; effects irony: 36-7, 64; Pi.'s most ingenious invention: 53-4.
First person. *Persona* of the poet or of the chorus?: 244, 264, 540-2; *persona* of the victor?: 541-2. See further: fictional mimesis of *ex tempore* speech, intimacy, performance, spontaneity.
Fluency: 41, 70-6, 145, 163, 442, 550, 577.
Flute. See: *aulos, kalamos.*
Focus. Verb has focus: 527; lacks focus: 104-5, 136, 152, 343; background information lacks focus: 139-40, 502; focus function slot: 270.
Foil: 13-4, 42, 224, 253.
Friendship. Between poet and patron: 9-10, 220, 396-7, 491.
Froth. Not produced in early summer in Canada: 405[321].
Future tense. 'Encomiastic' or 'performative' future: 2-3[2], 121; announcing next theme: 121; announcing that a theme will not be dealt with: 121-2; fictionally announcing the ode as a whole: 43, 200, 241, 267, 563, 617.

Gelegenheitsdichtung. See: occasional poetry.
Genealogies of moral concepts. See: personification.
Genitive. Effects implicitness: 32-3; article with genitive (ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ): 116; genitive *vis-à-vis* -θεν: 250-1; 'partitive': 538; genitive absolute: 530-1, 585.

Giants: 489; see further: Porphyrion.
Gnome: 25, 78, 83, 86, 123, 125-6, 209-11, 218-20, 227, 229, 287-8, 308, 311, 433-4, 448, 449-50, 452, 490-5, 524, 589, 634-5.
Gnomic aorist. See: aspect.
Graces: 84, 193, 255, 503-4.
Gradual unfolding. See: suspense.
Guest-friendship. Praise of hospitality a *topos:* 111; *xenia* crucial for a seafaring nation: 62-3, 111-2, 199[1]; reciprocal concept: 63, 111-2; Aeginetan *xenia* thematized in *N.*5: 62-88, cf. 158-9; mythical exemplum for Aeginetan *xenia:* 63; *xenia* between poet and patron: 9-10, 111.

Habit. Descriptions of characters not primarily in action rare in Pi.: 346. See further: iterativity.
Hair. See: beard.
Harmony. See: music.
Helenus: 230, 368.
Helorus. Battle: 8.
Hendiadys: 44[86].
Heraclea. See: Marathon, Thebes.
Heracles. Theban hero: 204, 311; founder of the Nemean games (first labour): 16, 224, 228; subdues the Amazons (ninth labour): 209, 321-2; makes the seas navigable: 228, 294-5; erects the Pillars (tenth labour): 44, 202-3, 224-8, 288-9, 295-6; expedition against Troy: 208-9, 319-20; his physical qualities make him a fit emblem for a victor in the pancration: 16, 224; his apotheosis: 289-90; both a hero and a god: 203, 228, 289-91; creates the conditions for Aegina to prosper: 227-8.
Heraea. See: Aegina.
Herald. At the games: 110, 123.
Hesiod. Mentioned by Pi.: 490; alluded to by Pi.: 490.
Hesychia. See: ἡϲυχία in the Index of Greek Words.
High jump. See: jump.
Himera. Warm water springs: 8[15]; battle: 8.
Hippolyta. See: Peleus.
Historicism. 'Historical allegory': 3, 12-3; Wilamowitz' historicism: 3-4; method of historicism challenged by research into conventions: 4-6; by text-immanent approaches: 6-7, 15-6; by Panhellenic dimension of Pi.'s odes: 7-11; modern historicism: 11-2; historicism not incompatible with unity: 15-8; method of historicism: 18-21, 427-9.
Homer. Mentioned by Pi.: 123, 371, 518; alluded to by Pi.: 199, 211, 213, 351; Pi. uses epic diction: 163, 199, 211, 213, 343, 345, 349, 353, 385[275], 499-500, 507, 583, 584, 625; gives an epic epithet a new application: 416; uses rhythmical sequences which conjure up epic verse: 163, 238.
Homosexuality: 283-5.
Honey. See: song.
Hospitality. See: guest-friendship.
Hybris. See: ὕβριϲ in the Index of Greek Words.
Hyperbaton. See: word order.
Hyperboreans: 289.
Hypercorrection. Of scribes: 131, 342.
Hypomnesis. See: prayer.

Iconicity: 49, 538-9.
Imagery. Actively involves the audience: 25; geographical imagery for break off interacts with the settings of mythical stories: 70, 126-7, 132, 204, 302; thus not in break off passages: 548; both connotations and denotation of the *vehicle* are relevant: 323; image of the eagle: 70, 131-4, 221-3, 325-6, 413-9; image of the bee: 22, 399, 402-3 (see also: song, compared to honey); athletic imagery: 129-30, 131, 207, 210-1, 229, 318, 332, 446-7, 476, 572-7, 657-9, 664-5; nautical imagery: 83-4, 184-6, 204, 288, 302-3, 451, 486-7, 595, 601-2; 'path of song': 180-1, 204, 303, 548, 560-1; ballistic imagery: 123, 133-4, 217, 374-5, 550-1; images of light and dark: 17, 217, 220[47], 223, 330-1, 370-2, 419, 421, 599-600; images of high and low: 285, 417, 447, 471, 575, 576,

583, 593; imagery of vegetation: 107-8; image of the chariot: 138[90], 218[45], 389, 398, 525, 646; images of dreams and shadows: 598-9; metaphor of touching or mingling: 30-2, 172, 173-4, 362-3, 504, 549; of falling: 171, 504, 574, 593; metaphorical mother?: 106, 244, 337, 585-6; mixed metaphor: 134, 657[116]; 'soothening' a metaphor: 374[256], 398, 475, 550-1. For other metaphors and similes for 'song' see: song.
Imperative. Fictionally announcing the ode as a whole: 200, 241; present tense imperative refers to continuation of action: 82, 182, 258, 451, 600-1; direct imperatives to victor to limit his desires: 391.
Imperfect tense. See: aspect, past tense.
Implicitness. As a characteristic of Pi.'s style: 53-4; relevance of the myth implicit: 23-4, 41, 434; of *gnomae:* 25, 336; on the level of intersentential relations: 26-30; effected by δέ: 25, 27, 28-30, 74[25], 156, 252, 308-9, 336, 385, 413, 416-7, 577, 633, 638; by asyndeton: 27, 131, 311; implicitness within the sentence: 30-3; effected by verbs of 'touching' or 'mingling': 30-1, 173-4; by colourless verbs: 31-2, 192-3, 280[74], 306[126], 524-5; by *litotes:* 393; by the genitive: 32-3; by ϲύν: 377-8; by ἀμφί: 518-9; implicitness actively involves the audience: 25, 28, 31, 32, 33-4, 50, 65, 393, 440-1; effects polyinterpretability: 25-6, 28-30, 34, 156, 223, 308-9, 638; ties in with fiction of spontaneity: 26.
Inborn capacities. See: inherited excellence.
Inconcinnitas: 51-2, 101, 103, 108, 187, 336, 373, 521, 602.
Incongruency of number: 561.
Infinitive. Epexegetical: 125-6, 309-10, 313-4; with article: 126; *pro imperativo:* 663; implied subject necessarily the same as subject of governing finite verb?: 556-8.
Information unit: 48, 554.
Inherited excellence: 78, 86, 109, 167-8, 189-90, 207, 208, 209-11, 213, 215, 218-20, 226, 228-9, 324-9, 331, 382-3, 434, 435, 437-40, 452, 454, 505, 507, 519, 521, 523-4, 532, 540, 544-5, 549, 630.
Injury. See: wounds.
Intellectual dimension of Pi.'s art: 36-7, 53, 76, 206, 535; Pi. refers to the intellectual dimension of composing his songs: 255-7, 258, 518.
Intimacy. Fictional (?) intimacy between poet and patron: 9-10, 220.
Invocation: 143, 199, 216-7, 241, 372, 426, 550; renewed apostophe in the request section of a prayer: 554; cultic and rhapsodic traditions: 242, 426. See also: prayer.
Iolaus: 208-9, 320-1.
Iolcus. See: Peleus.
Irony. In break off passages: 36-7, 64, 120, 206, 311; in characterization of a narrative character: 147, 535-7, 539; in reference to ealier authorities: 212, 350-2.
Ismenion. See: Thebes.
Isthmian games. Opening ceremony described: 77, 164-5.
Iterativity: 152, 154, 344, 348-9.

Jason: 213-4, 353.
Jump: 129-30.
Juxtaposition. Of two nouns: 291-2; of rhythmical sequences: 92-7, 234-40, 460-6.

Kalamos: 165.
Khreos-motif. See: χρέοϲ-motif (sub ch-).
Kithara: 264-6.
Kranzdeponie. See: dedication of crown.

Lex talionis: 426-7, 433, 473-6, 482.
Litotes: 272, 287, 393-4, 503, 521.
'Logical' relations. Left implicit in poetry: 26-30.
Long jump. See: jump.
'Looking' of gods as a sign of their favour: 558-9.
Lycians: 361.
Lyre: 137-8, 264-6; played with a plectrum: 138-9.

Marathon. Heraclea: 447, 578.
Megara. Games: 81, 175, 223, 420-1, 447, 577.
Memnon: 215, 230, 363, 366-8.
Menander. See: trainer.
Mercantile aspect of Pi.'s art. See: economics.
Metaphor. See: imagery.
Metre. Generates suspense: 52; as in indication of tempo of music?: 47-8; metre of *N.*5: 92-7; of *N.*3: 234-40; of *P.*8: 460-6; dactylo-epitrites defined: 93; analyzed: 92-7; aeolic metre defined: 461; analyzed: 234-40, 460-6; connection with Aeolian mode?: 408-9; clausula effect: 92-7, 237-40, 463-6. See also: enjambment.
Money. See: economics.
Monument. See: song.
Mood. See: emotion.
Muse. Daughter of Zeus: 260-2; chorus of Muses sing for Peleus on Mount Pelion: 70-6, 134-6; always begin their song with Zeus: 71, 142-3, 261; use a *phorminx:* 138; invocation of a single Muse reminiscent of epic tradition: 199, 242-3; poet acknowkledges his dependence on the Muse: 200, 244, 255-7; Muse guarantees that the victor's fame lives on: 223, 517-8, 626-7; 'carrying' the Muse 306; Clio: 223, 419, 626-7.
Music. Tempo of music: 47, 49; musical mode: 191[220], 408-9; nome: 140-1; harmony: 442, 559; Musical instruments are listed separately.
Myrmidons: 43, 201, 269, 620-3.
Myth. Relevance explained as 'historical allegory': 3; relevance implicit: 23-4; Pi. draws on the audience's knowledge of the myth: 145, 436, 497, 535; Pi. is misleading about relevance: 24, 438; myth is introduced casually: 23-4, 37-41; Pi. alters myths: 43, 44-5, 207, 208-9, 214, 316, 319, 320-1; suppresses certain elements of the myth: 74-5, 159-60; invents myths: 212, 335, 350-1, 497; mythical exempla outside Pi.: 23. See further: narrative technique.
Narrative technique. Story not told chronologically: 70-6, 145, 321; frame-story: 70-6, 135; story introduced by 'abstract': 340-1; story integrated in drift of the preceding argument: 70-6, 135-6, 314-5; end of story allows for smooth transition: 70-6, 145, 163, 442, 550, 577; story formally closed off: 216-7, 369-70; story not formally closed off: 70-6, 78, 79-80, 85-6, 142; shift of point of view: 347, 540; prophecy betrays the point of view of the seer: 535-7, 539. See further: myth, ring composition, suspense.
'Near and the far': 218-20, 227, 311, 389-91.
Nemean games: 80; site: 279.
Ne plus ultra motif: 20, 44, 202, 225-6, 282-3, 287-9, 389-92.
New Criticism: 6-7, 14-5.
Nike. Goddess Victory: 79, 170-1.
Nile: 289.
Nisus: 175.
Nominative. *Pro vocativo?:* 396-7.

Obscuritas. Pi.'s reputation of being difficult: 1, 2.
Occasional poetry. The occasional nature of Pi.'s odes: 1-21; allows for certain inconsistencies: 247.
Oenona. See: Aegina.
Oenophyta. Battle. See: Athens.
Oenopia. See: Aegina.
'Old Oligarch': 431.
Omphalos. See: Delphi.
Opponents. Victor's beaten opponents mentioned: 447-8, 579-87.
Optative. Desiderative: 130; oblique 366; indicative instead of oblique optative: 301; εἰ with optative: 491-2.
Oracle. See: Delphi.
Orality. See: fictional mimesis of *ex tempore* speech.
Oxymoron: 200, 203, 289, 338, 361, 537, 616, 618.

Pancration. Invented by Theseus: 179[189]; rules: 278-9, 581-2. See also: wounds.

Panhellenic dimension of Pi.'s odes: 7-11, 102, 579-80.
Parnassus. Mt.: 502.
Participle. Postposed aorist participle clause provides external motivation: 158. See also: genitive absolute.
Past tense. Referring back to an earlier moment during the performance: 373-4. See further: aspect, temporal framework.
Πεῖρα-motif: 218-20, 227, 271, 382-3, 386, 521, 625-6.
Peleus. Praying for Aegina: 63, 65, 85, 112, 115; murders Phocus: 63-8, 85, 117, 120, 505[48]; exiled: 62[2], 86-7, 111, 117, 120; Hippolyta tries to seduce him, but he refuses: 70-6, 144-5, 155-9; Acastus attempts to kill him: 144; he is given Thetis because of a prophecy: 74-5, 159-60; subdues Thetis: 68, 161, 208, 214, 317-8; marries her in the presence of the gods: 68, 70-6, 85, 137, 159-60, 214; returns to Iolcus, sacks it, kills Acastus: 44, 68, 207, 316.
Pelion. Mt.: 137, 214.
Pentathlon: 129.
Perfect tense: 69[18], 119-20, 314-5, 587, 595.
Performance. Dramatized: 34-6, 43, 200; choral or solo performance?: 242, 249, 267-8, 373-4, 562-3; instrumental solo performance: 140-1; chorus performing merges with fictional chorus: 70-6, 79-80, 85-6; first and later audiences: 7-11, 102, 141; odes performed at the venue of the victory: 2-3[2]. See further: audience, chorus. For the κῶμος see Index of Greek Words.
Performative present: 546; 'performative' future. See: future tense.
Pericles: 430.
Persian wars: 7, 67[13], 425.
Personification: 67, 103, 122, 124, 146, 148, 244, 472, 565-6; genealogies of moral concepts: 469.
Phayllus: 130.
Phocus. Praying for Aegina: 63, 65, 85, 112, 115; murdered by Peleus and Telamon: 63-8, 85, 117, 120, 505[48].
Phorminx: 71, 137-8, 264-6; played with a plectrum: 138-9.
Phrygians: 361-2.
Φιλία motif. See: friendship.
Φθόνος-motif. See: envy.
Pillars of Heracles: 287-9, 391-2. See further also: Heracles, *ne plus ultra* motif.
Plataea. Battle: 8.
Poetic credentials. Pi. emphasises the quality of his song: 72, 76, 133, 200, 217, 221, 241, 377, 398-9, 404; presents himself as superior to his rivals: 210[25], 222-3, 326.
Poikilia. See: diversity.
Point of view. See: narrative technique.
Polyinterpretability: 25-6, 28-30, 34, 73-4, 128[65], 155-6, 205-6, 217, 221-3, 308-9, 377-8, 383, 427, 474-6, 479-82, 492-3, 495, 535, 539, 548-9, 574, 638; of rhythmical sequences: 237-40, 462-6; ambiguity avoided: 260, 481-2.
Πόνος-motif: 5, 20, 178, 226, 277-8, 444-5, 662.
Porphyrion: 427, 433-4, 441, 452, 487-90, 492-3, 496-8.
Poseidon. God of the seas: 77; partron of the Isthmian games: 76-7, 164; rivalry with Zeus over Thetis: 74-5, 159-60, 162-3.
Prayer: 63, 65, 85, 112, 115, 442-7, 451, 550-3, 556-8, 600-1; *hypomnesis:* 552-3, 554; renewed apostophe in the request section of a prayer: 554. See also: invocation.
Priamel: 251; 'summary-priamel': 253; use of *ritenuto* in priamels: 48.
Primitive. Archaic style described as primitive: 27-8, 30-1.
Prolepsis: 146-7, 163, 414.
Promptitude of action. Heroes do things at once: 158, 161.
'Puer-senex' motif: 387.
Pun: 83[50], 171, 200[3], 223, 258, 505, 627.
Purple passages: 10.
Pythagoras: 641[84].
Pythian games. In Delphi and Cirrha: 501; importance of the venue

emphasized: 551. See further: Apollo, Delphi.

Relative pronoun and relative connection: 24, 37-41, 76, 113, 163, 270, 292, 394[300], 497-8; cf. 269; resumes the topic: 257, 347, 487; cf. 583. See further: attraction, word order.
Remedial power of song. See: victory, presented as healing the victor's wounds.
Repetition. See: echo.
Retardation. See: suspense.
Rhyme. See: sound effect.
Ring composition: 84, 200, 214, 217, 221, 358, 448, 592; in rhythmical profile: 96-7, 238-40, 464-5.

Salamis. Battle: 7, 8.
Second person. Shifts between third and second person in reference to the victor: 172-3, 394, 577.
Self-conciousness. Pi. emphasises the quality of his song: see: poetic credentials.
Self-reliance. Of heroes thematized: 201, 203, 207, 212, 215-6, 230, 297-8, 348, 361.
Seven against Thebes: 436-40, 452, 525-6, 529, 532-7.
Shield emblem: 437[28], 533-4.
Silence. Diplomatic silence: 125. See further: truth.
Sogenes' house: 8[15].
Song. Compared to monuments: 62, 99-100, 249, 509; to a drink: 220-1, 251, 398-9, 412, 448, 546; to honey: 399, 401-3; to dew: 399, 404-5; nome: 140-1; 'path of song' see: imagery; Pi. emphasises the quality of his song: see: poetic credentials; remedial power of song: see: victory, presented as healing the victor's wounds.
Sound effect: 49, 410; alliteration: 131[72]; alliteration avoided: 168-9; rhyme: 504.
Speech caps: 531.
Spontaneity. Fiction of spontaneity: 9-10; as a characteristic of Pi.'s style: 53-4; effected by implicitness: 24, 26, 53-4; by fictional mimesis of *ex tempore* speech: 35-6, 53-4, 64-5; by *inconcinnitas:* 52; by *zeugma:* 502-3; by taking the audience back to the scene of the victory: 280, 501-2, 563-5; by emphasizing willingness to praise: 555.
Strength. Of athletes: 104, 128, 165, 273, 642[85].
Subject postponed. See: suspense.
Subjunctive. Deliberative: 304-6; short vowel: 304[120]; of general condition in relative clause (with and without ἄν/κε): 385.
Suspense: 41-54; effected by retardation: 42, 241, 271, 286-7, 420; by break-off: 42-4, 435; by manipulating myths: 43, 44, 45; by gradual unfolding: 73, 527, 530, 540, 561; fulfilment of expectation postponed: 42, 69; expectation partly fulfilled: 44-5, 520; expectation not fulfilled: 42, 269, 435, 471, 472, 477; syntactical suspense: 50-1, 268-9, 287, 478, 506, 585[205]; effected by postponement of subject: 115, 268-9, 535-6; metrical suspense: 52; audience's suspense thematized: 43, 241. See further: narrative technique.
Switch reference. See: topic shift *sub* topic.

Telamon. Praying for Aegina: 63, 65, 85, 112, 115; murders Phocus: 63-8, 85, 117, 120, 505[48]; exiled: 62[2], 86-7, 111, 117, 120; sacks Troy: 208, 319-20; his expedition against the Amazons: 209, 321-2.
Tempo: 47-9.
Temporal framework. From perspective of first performance: 8, 587; temoral setting of the myth defined explicitly: 336-8, 346, 360, 362; shift from present to past marked: 113, 206-7, 270, 314, 352[213], 527; shift from past to an earlier episode in the past marked: 321; shift from past to present marked: 168, 217.
Thearion. See: Aegina, *thearos.*
Thearos: 380-2; victor becomes *thearos:* 20, 201-2, 218, 220, 227, 378, 621.

Thebes. Ismenion: 8[15]; Electrae gate: 8[15]; Heraclea: 8[16]. See also: Seven against Thebes, Epigonoi.
Theoxenia: 8[16], 113[38].
Theseus. Invented pancration: 179[189].
Thetis. See: Peleus.
Thirty Years Peace. See: Athens.
Thucydides son of Milesias: 431[17].
Tmesis: 187, 375-6, 558.
Topic. Topic shift effected by reference to new topic before δέ: 128[65], 142, 155, 160, 222-3, 252, 267, 336, 345-6, 479, 535-6, 538, 589; by other means: 137, 545, 577; contrasting topic left implicit: 223, 418; topic marked by γε: 271-2; topic resumed with relative pronoun: 257, 347, 487; cf. 583; topic not necessarily the same as subject: 155, 479; layering of topics: 252, 538; topic distribution obscured: 320, 413-4, 506, 509-10, 593; 'false' topic shift: 479; conditions for topic shift to occur between main clause and subclause: 543.
Trainer. Characteristics of trainer praise: 81-2[40-2], 216[39]; 'praise' of Menander: 19, 81-4, 86, 177-80; Athenian trainers in general: 179; absence of trainer: 201, 216, 230; athlete becomes trainer: 216[40], 230-1.
Tranquility. See: ἡcυχία in the Index of Greek Words.
Truth. *Vis-à-vis* lying: 75-6, 87-8; *vis-à-vis* silence: 67-8, 88, 124; power of poetry to manipulate truth: 76, 122-4; Pi.'s attitude towards truth: 122-4.
Two-sidedness. As a theme in *P.*8: 441-2, 448, 453, 477-8, 498, 545.
Typhos: 427, 433-4, 452, 492-3, 494-8.

Ugliness. Victor's ugliness thematized: 284.
Unity: 1-21.

Variation. See: diversity.
Veiling. As a manifestation of αἰδώc: 67-8, 75.
Venue of the victory. See: performance.
Verbal echo, correspondance. See: echo.
Victory. Presented as an honour to one's ancestors: 109, 201, 207, 210, 215, 271-3, 325, 328 (see further also: inherited excellence); as an honour to one's home town: 110, 200, 217-8, 228, 375, 378, 431, 514; as an honour to one's clan: 436, 522-3; as proof of divine favouring: 79-80, 85-6, 88, 434, 446, 451, 583; as a reward for morally commendable conduct: 79, 85-6, 434, 450 (cf. 434-5, 439-40); as the victor's destiny: 201, 630; as healing the victor's wounds: 202, 231[76], 276-7, 354, 398, 474-5; as a reason to hope for future success: 220; as confirming the validity of a mythical model: 525; victory celebrations presented as symbolising aristocratic supremacy: 88, 432, 434, 439, 444, 445-6, 450, 453-4; as symbolising political tranquility: 431-2, 443-4, 445-6, 448, 453-4. See also: Nike.
Vocative. *Nominativus pro vocativo?:* 396-7.

Warning. Victor warned by the poet? 202, 225-6, 282-3, 389-92, 449-50, 662-3. See also: *ne plus ultra* motif.
Wealth. See: economics.
Willingness. Poet thematizes his willingness to praise: 36, 135-6, 200, 397, 443, 555.
Witness motif: 294.
Word order: 49-51, 268-9, 339-41, 395-6, 538-9, 413-4, 478, 509-10, 538-9, 549, 593, 632; first position in clause marked: 342, 395; final position in clause marked: 50-1, 63, 115, 125, 136, 287, 296, 434, 497; *hyperbaton* of adjective: 122, 199[1], 220[47], 268, 296, 395, 404; of pronoun: 203, 273, 292.
Word play. See: pun.
Wounds. In combat sports: 20, 202, 214, 226, 276-7, 278-9, 580.
Wrestling. Techniques: 574-5, 576; tournament system: 581-2. See further: athletic imagery *sub* imagery.

Xenia. See: guest-friendship.

Zero option. Instead of repeated verb: 379.

Zeugma: 259[41], 293, 502-3, 572.

Zeus. God of the heavens: 160, 260-2; patron of the Nemean games: 143, 216-7, 372; primogenitor of the Aeginetan elite: 143, 216-7, 372; father of the Muses: 260-2; subject of the Muses' song: 142-3, 261; killed Typhos: 427, 492-3, 495-8; rivalry with Poseidon over Thetis: 74-5, 159-60, 162-3; Hellenius: 63, 113-4; Xeinios: 70-6, 142, 158-9; 'father': 114.

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY J. M. BREMER, L. F. JANSSEN, H. PINKSTER
H. W. PLEKET, C. J. RUIJGH AND P. H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series:

171. Bakker, E.J. (ed.). *Grammar as Interpretation.* Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10730 4
172. Grainger, J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10799 1
173. Gerber, D.E. (ed.). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09944 1
174. Sandy, G. *The Greek World of Apuleius.* Apuleius and the Second Sophistic. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10821 1
175. Rossum-Steenbeek, M. van. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMahon, J.M. *Paralysin Cave.* Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. Isaac, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. Keen, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia.* A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. Georgiadou, A. & D.H.J. Larmour. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. Günther, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. Hunt, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. Hamel, D. *Athenian Generals.* Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. Whitby, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power.* The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. Schrier, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. Sicking, C.M.J. *Distant Companions.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. Schrijvers, P.H. *Lucrèce et les sciences de la vie.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. Billerbeck M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. Mackay, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality.* The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. Albrecht, M. von. *Roman Epic.* An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. Hout, M.P.J. van den. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. Kraus, C. Shuttleworth (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. Lomas, K. & T. Cornell. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. Malkin, I. *History of Greek Colonization.* ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. Wood, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. Ophuijsen, J.M. van & P. Stork. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. Pfeijffer, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9